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 1987b, 1991, 1995); 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, b; 1991, 1994, 2002, 2003). According to this view, the Hungarian nuclear clause (S in (1987a, b) 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 1994, 2002, 2003).¹

(1) a. \[ VP \ [v \ V \ DP_{subj} \ DP_{obj}] \] b. \[ VP \ [v \ V \ DP_{obj} \ DP_{subj}] \]

In this paper I argue that notwithstanding the descriptive merits of the flat VP analysis, Hungarian is better characterized instead as featuring (local) Japanese type scrambling.

¹ I would like to thank Katalin É. Kiss and members of her project group at the Research Institute for Linguistics in Budapest, where the analysis proposed here was first presented in April 2005, for helpful questions and comments. Thanks are also due to the audience at NELS 36, as well as Elsi Kaiser, who I first shared and discussed the core of the approach with at ConSOLE 7 in Bergen in 1998, and Máté Bánki, who was ready to kindly perform an extensive pilot test to collect judgments on some of the sentence types I draw on. All errors, of course, are my own. The generous support of grant No. D-048454 of OTKA (Hungarian Scientific Research Fund) is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

This is not to say that the configurational view has lacked proponents (see, esp., Horváth 1986 and Marácz 1989). Nevertheless, the implementations of that approach were partly incomplete and partly descriptively inadequate, or/and relied on analytic devices that are no longer formulable in the current framework. A terminological caveat: permutation in the flat VP has also been referred to as ‘scrambling’.

In É. Kiss (1994), 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.
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. Section 3 points out that on the one hand, Hungarian does not share the properties of either one of the two well-studied classes of non-configurational languages, while on the other, fundamental implications involving scrambling that have been noted in the literature are applicable to the language. In section 4 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 5 presents a host of asymmetries that are problematic under a flat VP analysis, but fall out on a scrambling approach modulo the hierarchical vP that account assumes. Section 6 demonstrates that Hungarian (local) scrambling is of the Japanese-type (and contrasts with German or Slavic scrambling). Section 7 concludes the paper, and spells out some of the consequences of its results.

2. Coverage of the flat VP analysis

The empirical evidence presented in support of the flat VP analysis of Hungarian free postverbal word order all involve a lack of some S/O asymmetry (É. Kiss 1987a, b; 1994, 2002, 2003). The facts reviewed here are assumed to follow from a flat VP structure.

(i) If the VP is flat, the lack of WCO effects with short wh-movement of the object can be explained in the following way: the WCO effect does not obtain, because the object is moved from a position where it c-commands the (pronominal variable inside the) subject.3

(ii) The lack of a Superiority effect in multiple wh-fronting of arguments of the same verb is also expected, since neither argument is generated higher than the other.

(2) [Kit\textsubscript{ACC}: hívott fel \textit{[az pro\textsubscript{i} anyja\textsubscript{NOM}]} t\textsubscript{i}?
who-acc called-3sg up the (his,) mother-poss.3sg-nom
*Who\textsubscript{i} did his\textsubscript{i} mother call up?"

(3) a. Ki mit vett? b. Mit ki vett?
who what-acc bought what-acc who-nom bought
‘Who bought what?’

(iii) As opposed to configurational languages of the English type, Hungarian, besides V+O idioms, also has idioms composed of V+S, exemplified below.

(4) Jánost eszi a fene
J-acc eat-3sg the plague-nom
‘John is experiencing envy.’

---

2 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, scrambling envisaged to apply in Hungarian displaces not only DPs, but also PPs and, albeit to a more limited extent, clauses as well.

3 WCO effects are not wholly absent: they are attested in long wh-movement (Puskás 2000: 293).
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(iv) Hungarian has no that-trace effects, and no ban on wh-extraction across a local [Spec,CP] filled by another wh-phrase. (v) Condition C effects obtain with R-expressions inside objects and subjects alike. (5) illustrates binding into the subject by the object.

(5) *Tegnap felhívta a fiúk anyjáNOM óketACC, 
yesterday up-called-3sg the boys’ mother-poss.3sg-nom them
‘Yesterday the boys’ mother called them up.’ [judgment from É. Kiss 2002]

(vi) 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. (vii) S/O asymmetries are nevertheless manifested in anaphor and pronominal variable binding. 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, 1994) posits a Primacy Condition, which subsumes these two factors disjunctively in order to cover the complete set of anaphor and pronominal variable binding facts.

3. Correlates of non-configurationality and scrambling

Before we move on to examine how much water these arguments hold, let us take a moment to inspect two more general questions that bear on the issue raised in this paper: first, whether Hungarian shares the properties of well-studied non-configurational languages, and second, whether Hungarian is characterized by the features that are commonly seen as correlates of the scrambling property.

The theme of (non-)configurationality has occupied center stage in research in free word order beginning from the late seventies. It has been established by now that, scrambling aside, non-configurationality is not a syntactically uniform phenomenon: non-configurational languages belong to two (or possibly more) main groups (see, e.g., Baker 2001, and references therein). Pronominal argument languages (aka head-marking languages, e.g. Mohawk, cf. Nichols 1986, Jelinek 1984) are characterized among others by the absence of Condition C effects within a clause, presence of WCO effects both with subjects and with objects, absence of NP anaphors, absence of non-referential quantifiers (e.g., ‘nobody’, or universal quantifiers with singular agreement), discontinuous constituents (e.g., separability of determiners from their NP) and massive pro-drop. In contrast, dependent-marking languages like Warlpiri (to which Jelinek’s 1984 account is not straightforwardly applicable) are characterised by the absence of WCO effects as well as by the presence of Condition C effects with subjects and objects alike. As predicted by the ‘pro-as-argument’ analysis (common to head-marking and dependent-marking languages), Warlpiri allows pro-drop in all argument positions, it does not allow non-referential NPs as true quantifiers or simple NP anaphors (like Mohawk), and as predicted by the ‘lexical-arguments-as-secondary-predicates’ hypothesis characterising dependent-marking languages, the nominal/adjective distinction is neutralised in Warlpiri, a nominal cannot be separated from its clause, discontinuous constituents are extremely free (all these properties are absent from Mohawk) (see Baker 2001).
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Hungarian differs significantly both from head-marking and from dependent-marking non-configurational languages. It allows only subject pro-drop fully, object pro-drop is severely restricted, and non-object complement pro-drop is absent. WCO is absent from local wh-movement contexts, but is attested clause-internally in some other constructions. Condition C effects are present in some cases where English does not have them, but its distribution is narrower than in dependent-marking languages. Hungarian has NP anaphors and non-referential quantifier NPs. Discontinuous expressions are atypical (e.g., the possessor is in some cases separable from the possessed noun), and are amenable to a movement analysis (see Szabolcsi 1983). The nominal/adjective distinction is prominent, and nominals can move out of their local clause into superordinate clauses. In short, Hungarian does not fall neatly into either one of the two best studied major classes of non-configurational languages.

On the other hand, a number of implications involving scrambling that have been noted in the literature are apparently applicable to Hungarian. A frequently advocated generalization is that scrambling implicates V-raising (e.g. Tada 1993, Saito 1992, Miyagawa 2001). According to several recent accounts of Hungarian clause structure (e.g., Szabolcsi 1997, Puskás 2000), the verb always undergoes movement out of the vP. It has been suggested that scrambling languages are pro-drop languages (e.g., Grewendorf and Sabel 1999); as pointed out above, Hungarian has pro-drop. Head-finality of the VP is also often assumed to be as a correlate of scrambling (e.g., Fukui 1993, Haider and Rosengren 2003). Given that the verb is invariably raised out of the VP in Hungarian, an underlying OV analysis is compatible with Hungarian (note also that PPs, NPs and attributive AdjPs are all head-final in the language). A last feature to be mentioned here that is sometimes (rather controversially) claimed to be implicated by the scrambling property is rich morphology, more specifically, rich case morphology or/and rich verbal agreement. Both of these characterize Hungarian.

4. Reducing subject-object symmetries to scrambling

Next I demonstrate that the various forms of a lack of an S/O asymmetry (i–vi) enumerated in section 2 above 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.

In particular, (i) and (ii) lose force because scrambling is known to obviate WCO and Superiority violations (see (2) and (3), respectively) in scrambling languages generally (e.g., Haider 1986, Saito 1992, Witschko 1998, Fanselow 2001, and especially Fanselow 2004). The obviation effect follows, assuming that an object can undergo A-bar movement starting from a position above the subject, a position that is available to it pre-
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cisely due to scrambling. 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 (6) with universal quantifiers. The contrast in (6) would be explained on a flat VP
analysis by É. Kiss’s (1991, 1994) 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 vP account as well: QR
of the uQP (cf. Surányi 2002) produces a WCO configuration in (6a), but not in (6b).

(6) Nem ismerte fel . . .
not recognized-3sg PV . . . [pv = Preverb]
a. *? [az a férfi, aki bement pro3SGi hozzá] [mindegyik lányt]
that the man-nom who in-went-3sg to.heri every girl-acc
‘*?The man who dropped by heri didn’t recognize every girl.’
b. [mindegyik lányi]i [azt a férfit, aki bement pro3SGi hozzá]
every girl-nom acc that the man-acc who in-went-3sg to.heri
‘Every girli didn’t recognize the man who dropped by heri.’

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 2004 for a defense of the tradi-
tional view). If we apply this overt form of QR in (6a), we get (7), and somewhat surpris-
ingly, the degradation of (6a) almost completely disappears.

(7) (?)[Mindegyik lányt]i felismerte ti ‘az a férfi, aki bement pro3SGi hozzá] ti
recognized-3sg that the man-nom who in-went-3sg to.heri

Again, the Primacy Condition, which disjunctively involves precedence as a condition on
binding, is able to cover this fact. However, the same fact receives an explanation on the
scrambling account too, and does so in the same way as in (2): in the derivation of (7), the
object is first scrambled to a position above the subject (= ti ’), and is moved to its prever-
bal position in a second step. 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 O into S precisely when O precedes S. On this
approach, the licensing condition of binding can simply be based on c-command, instead
of a theoretically less desirable disjunctive condition.

The appealing argument from idioms (iii) is inconclusive for two reasons. 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, idioms frequently cited to the instantiate
[V+S] the idiom type are not in fact disallowed in a hierarchical VP structure on Ma-
rantz’s (1984) assumptions either. [V+S] idioms involving a subject that is arguably an
underlying internal argument of the verb, such as unaccusatives, are predicted to be al-
lowed. Piroskának leesett az álla lit. ‘Piroska-dat fell the jaw’ and Piroskának kinyílt a
szeme ‘Piroska-dat opened the eye’ (cited in É. Kiss 2002) exemplify this type of idiom. 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 frighten, cf. Belletti and Rizzi 1988); see (8a). This type of example has often been used, albeit wrongly, to back up the flat VP analysis (see e.g., É. Kiss 1987a: 22-23); see (8b), as well as (4) above.

(8) a. Ivan-a zajela sovest’
   Ivan-acc up.ate conscience-nom
   ‘Ivan’s conscience is troubling him.’

b. Jánost elkapta a gépszij
   J-acc pv-caught the driving-belt-nom
   [É. Kiss 2003: 26]
   ‘John is intensively involved / caught up in something.’

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). Subject idioms are clearly the marked case, however, in fact 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 idioms to back up a flat VP analysis.

Moving on to the observations in (iv), it is easy to see that they are wholly 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 vP-internal subjects (Bennis 1986), properties that are applicable to Hungarian and that can be found in configurational languages as well. Regarding the grammaticality of wh-extraction across a local [Spec,CP] filled by another wh-phrase, this is a feature that can be explained in terms of the left-peripheral configuration underlying Bulgarian-type multiple wh-fronting (see Rudin 1988), and also by the availability of a vP-internal surface position to subjects, e.g., Italian, Spanish (see Sabel 2002).

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 status of examples like (5): 10 out of the 25 informants whose judgments I have had access to found examples analogous to (5) degraded, but not unacceptable (? or ??), and 7 speakers judged them to be OK (8 informants rejected them as ?* or *). Second, the degradation found in (5) can partly be put down to the position 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 prefer to be close to the verb, once they are postverbal (Varga 1981). This is corroborated by the fact that when the subject ex-

---

5 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.

6 Nunberg, Sag and Wasow (1994) argue that many idioms are in fact compositional: the parts of these idioms have contextually restricted metaphorical interpretations, which combine transparently.
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pression 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 (5) 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.\(^7\)

(9) a. ?Péter, főnőke hívtta fel pro, reply to: Who called up Peter?
   Peter’s, boss-nom called up him
b. *Péter, főnőkét hívtta fel pro, reply to: Who did Peter call up?
   Peter’s, boss-acc called up he

It should also be noted that although examples with an O pronoun co-referring with a lexical possessor inside the S are of varied acceptability, speakers tend to find an S pronoun co-referring with a lexical possessor inside the O much worse. Although judgments of co-reference (involving nominative and accusative pronouns) are not so sharp as to base any strong argument on, they go in the expected direction if S is generated above O.\(^8\)

As for the observation of the freedom of postverbal constituent order, i.e. \(^{(vi)}\), it is evidently not compelling evidence in favor of a flat VP inasmuch as scrambling can derive the freedom in word order just as well. Scrambling will be predicted to be restricted

\(^7\) A similarly strong contrast is found with overt oblique case-marked internal argument pronouns, which lack a pro counterpart, see (i-ii).

(i) ?A legjobb barátom, anyja gyerekkorában nem foglalkozott vele,
   the best friend-poss.1sg mother-nom childhood-poss.3sg-in not took.care with.him
   ‘My best friend’s mother didn’t take care of him in his childhood.’

(ii) *A legjobb barátom, anyjával idős korában nem foglalkozott Ő,
   the best friend-poss.1sg mother-with old age-poss.3sg-in not took.care he
   *He did not take care of my best friend’s mother in her old age.’

On the other hand, with wh-possessors (instead of lexical possessors) we get no S/O asymmetry:

(iii) *Kinek, az anyja hívtta fel Ő, cf. (v) OK
   whose, the mother-poss.3sg-nom called up him, cf. (v) OK
   Whose mother called him up?

(iv) *Kinek, az anyját hívtta fel Ő, cf. (vi) *Whose mother did he call up?
   whose, the mother-poss.3sg-acc called up he, cf. (vi) *Whose mother did he call up?

This curious fact does not provide evidence for a flat VP analysis, however. The ungrammaticality of (iv) follows if S c-commands O inside the vP. As for (iii), I propose that it is ruled out as it is blocked by (vii).

(vii) OK
    who-acc called up the his mother-poss.3sg-nom
    *Whom, did his, mother call?’

Ruys (1994) argues that, given an interface economy approach (see Reinhart 2006 and references therein), (vi) is blocked in English by (v), because (v) is derivationally more economical than (vi). On account of its optionality, I take scrambling to incur no derivational cost (note that this would follow directly on a base-generation account of scrambling). Recall that I assumed above that (vii) is well-formed in the first place, because of the availability of a derivation involving scrambling of O above S prior to wh-movement. This means that (vii) involves a shorter wh-movement than (iii), therefore (iii) is blocked. An analogous paradigm is found with universal quantifiers in the place of wh-phrases, and the same blocking effect will be triggered. Note finally that (iii) is also out in German. German is configurational and has scrambling, hence the same logic of blocking can apply.

\(^8\) 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 postverbal field, if it is assumed that the verb is moved to the head of a projection above the $v_P$. That the verb is raised into the IP domain (in neutral sentences) is a view shared a.o. by Szabolcsi (1997) and by Puskás (2000). The exact identity of the projection hosting the verb is immaterial for the present purposes; for the sake of concreteness I will assume it to be AspP, immediately dominating $v_P$, in line with É. Kiss (2002, 2003).

Finally, the A-binding S/O asymmetries (= (vii)) can be captured in a hierarchical $v_P$ without directly relying on thematic prominence or linear precedence. Having shown that some of the arguments for a flat $v_P$ are ill-founded, and others are forceless once a scrambling account is considered as an alternative, in the next section I present phenomena of S/O asymmetries that seriously challenge the non-configurational VP analysis, and directly bolster a scrambling approach (modulo a hierarchical $v_P$).

5. Asymmetries supporting the hierarchical $v_P$ + scrambling view

In addition to the S/O asymmetry exhibited by universal QPs for WCO (see section 4), in this section I point out several other S/O asymmetries, which are all problematic for a flat $v_P$ approach, but are predicted if the Hungarian $v_P$ is hierarchical.\(^9\) The first asymmetry to be noted concerns effects of Superiority, which do obtain in various constructions—I illustrate with $n$-word fronting (9), where obviation by scrambling (cf. section 4) is dispreferred. Scrambling is disfavored (as an intermediate movement step) in the derivation of (9) (whence the lack of an obviation of WCO), 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 (9). In a context, however, where the object $n$-word can be interpreted as specific (quantifying over a familiar set), (9) becomes acceptable. As expected under a configurational analysis of $v_P$, if the subject $n$-word is fronted instead of the object $n$-word in (9), the sentence is acceptable once again.

(9) #Nyilvános helyen szerintem senkit se csókoljon meg senki
public place-on in.my.view noone-acc NEG kiss-subj-3sg PV noone-nom
intended: ‘I think nobody should kiss anybody in a public place.’

A second difference between S and O, one that is expected on a configurational analysis of $v_P$, is that subjects, but not objects (and other complements) are CED islands:

(10) a. Melyik tisztsülővel olvastál [egy interjút $t_i$]?
which official-with read-past-2sg an interview-acc
‘Which official did you read an interview with?’

b. *Melyik tisztsülővel 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 $t_i$] claim that the GDP is growing?’

Although judgments go in the direction expected on a configurational $v_P$ account, Condition C effects involving overt nominative and accusative pronouns do not result in a very

\(^9\) These asymmetries are not covered by the Primacy Condition on binding (cf. (vii) in section 2).
sharp contrast between S and O, as discussed in section 4 (recall that the difference is more prominent with silent pronouns, and oblique pronouns). However, Condition C effects do produce a strong S/O asymmetry in the domain of epithets (11a–b), A-bar reconstruction (11c–d), and lexical DPs (11e–f) (the latter is noted by Marácz 1989):

(11) a. János anyja nem is látogatja azt a szerencsétlen gyereket.
   John’s mother-nom not even visit-3sg that-acc the poor child-acc
   ‘John’s mother does not even visit that poor child.’

b. *Az a szerencsétlen gyerek nem is látogatja János anyját.
   that the poor child-nom not even visit-3sg John’s mother-acc
   ‘That poor child does not even visit John’s mother.’

c. *[A Jánossal, való beszélgetésünk] később letagadta (ő) tőle.
   the J-i-with EXPL discussion-poss.1pl-acc later PV-denied-3sg he
   ‘He later denied our discussion with John.’

d. [A Jánossal, való beszélgetésünk] rossz színben tüntette fel (ő) tőle.
   the J-i-with EXPL discussion-poss.1pl-nom bad color-in showed PV him
   ‘Our discussion with John gave him a bad reputation.’

e. Felhívta János anyósát.
   PV-called-3sg John’s mother-in-law-acc
   ‘John’s mother-in-law called John.’

f. *Felhívta János anyósát.
   PV-called-3sg John’s mother-in-law-acc

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, Surányi 2004). A fewer-QPOBJ cannot scope over a uQPSUBJ (12a), while a fewer-QPSUBJ can scope over the uQPQOBJ (12b):

(12) TAVALY végzett el . . .
   last.year did-3sg PV . . .

a. minden diák kevesebb mint öt kurzust.
   every student-nom fewer than five course-acc
   ‘It was last year that every student did fewer than 5 courses.’

b. kevesebb mint száz diák minden kurzust.
   fewer than hundred student-nom every course-acc
   ‘It was last year that fewer than 100 students did every course.’

Finally, 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, provided, of course, that S is generated higher than O.10, 11

10 A further piece of evidence supporting the same conclusion comes from the licensing of parasitic gaps, which is known to obey an anti-c-command condition. (In constructing the appropriate test case, it needs to be made sure that the gap cannot be construed as pro, which is why a plural indefinite wh-phrase is employed below.) (i) involves (long) wh-movement of an oblique complement across a parasitic gap inside the subject, and (ii) is the same, except that here it is an object wh-phrase that is being moved. In (iii) it is a
6. **Hungarian scrambling is of the Japanese type**

Having argued for the existence of a configurational vP and postverbal scrambling in Hungarian, I turn now to inspect the Hungarian postverbal scrambling operation in a little more detail. It will be demonstrated that the operation has the key properties of Japanese type local scrambling widely discussed in the literature. First, scrambling of the object above the subject feeds the binding of anaphors in the possessor position of S (see 13a–b) (similarly to Japanese local scrambling, and unlike the case in German, Slavic or Albanian scrambling; see, e.g., Grewendorf and Sabel 1999, Kitahara 2002, Saito 2003, Karimi 2003, and references therein). This follows if Hungarian scrambling is A-movement and Condition A is an ‘anywhere condition’ in the sense of Belletti and Rizzi (1988), Epstein et al. (1998), a.o. Scrambling also feeds pronominal variable binding, both in Hungarian (see (13c–d)) and in Japanese (see, e.g., Saito 2003: 485) (but not in German, see Grewendorf and Sabel 1999), to which the same explanation will extend.

(13) a. *Sokat kritizálják egy más szülei Jánost és Pétert
criticize-3pl each other’s parents-nom J.-acc and P.-acc

b. *EZEBEN A VÁROSBAN bántalmazott pro több diákja kevés tanárt
assaulted _pro_ several student-poss.3sg-nom few teacher-acc

It’s this town where few teachers were assaulted by several of their students.

---

11 Gáspár (2005: 261) discusses the contrast between the gapping examples (i) and (ii) in context that is largely independent of our present concerns. To the extent that the parallelism requirement in gapping/ellipsis is in general sensitive to parallelism of structure as well as interpretation, (i–ii) speak against the flat VP analysis, and in favor of a scrambling approach.

(i) Szereti Mari Jánost és Erzsi Ferit
loves M-nom J-acc and E-nom F-acc
‘Mari loves János and Feri loves Erzsi.’

(ii) *Szereti Mari Jánost és Ferit Erzsi
loves M-nom J-acc and F-acc E-nom
‘Mari loves János and Feri (loves) Erzsi.’
Sokat kritizálják [Jánost és Pétert], egymás szülei t, ‘John and Peter are criticized a lot by each other’s parents.’

Neither in Hungarian nor in Japanese does local scrambling feed or obviate Condition C:

(14) a. Látta (ön)magát i János t, a tükörben
    saw-3sg (his-)himself-acc J-nom t, the mirror-in
    ‘John saw himself in the mirror.’

b. [Zibunzisin-o i [John-ga t, semeta]]
    himself-acc J-nom t, blamed
    ‘John blamed himself.’

c. **Látták a fiúk anyját i Ők t, [cf. the discussion of (5)]
    saw-3pl the boy-pll mother-acc they-nom t, ‘*They, saw the boys’; mother.

d. *[[John-no hahaoya]-o i [kare-ga t, semeta ]]
    J-gen mother-acc he-nom t, blamed
    ‘*He, blamed John’s mother.’

The short scrambling operation does not induce WCO effects, rather, it obviates WCO violations, in Japanese and Hungarian alike (and also in German) (NB. if the object uQP moves only as far as the t′ position in (7), the result is still grammatical). Licensing of parasitic gaps (taken to be a property of A-bar movement) is not available under scrambling in Hungarian, unlike in German (and Dutch) (NB. parasitic gaps do not exist in Japanese, see Saito 1992). If scope interpretation in a Subj Obj order is unambiguously ‘S > O’, as in (12a), scrambling of Obj over Subj introduces scope ambiguity, as in (15). The same holds in Japanese, and German too.

(15) TAVALY végzett el kevesebb mint öt kurzust i minden diák t, [S > O, O > S]
    last.year did-3sg PV fewer than five course-acc, every student-nom t, ‘It was last year that every student did fewer than 5 courses.’

The properties of Hungarian postverbal scrambling most closely match those of Japanese short scrambling. It is not an objective of the present paper to choose from, or evaluate, alternative approaches to Japanese-type local scrambling (however, see section 7 for some comments), it may be useful to point out, nevertheless, that the successful account needs to differentiate A-binding (including binding of both anaphors and pronominal variables) and scope-taking, on the one hand, from effects of Condition C, on the

---

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 jó ügyvédet Mária ‘lit. Seeks a good lawyer-acc Mary-nom’ appear to be degraded if the object indefinite is non-specific, but judgments are less sharp in other cases.) At the same time, options for the projection of information focus are affected by scrambling in much the same way as in Japanese (cf. Miyagawa to appear, and references therein, see also Neeleman and Reinhart 1998 for a discussion of Dutch). A sentence like Meglátta János a tanárt ‘lit. Saw John-nom the teacher-acc’ can answer either What happened? or What did John do? or Who did John see?, whereas the scrambled Meglátta a tanárt János ‘lit. Saw the teacher-acc John-nom’ is inappropriate as an answer to the last two questions (and of course it can answer Who saw the teacher?).
other, in order to achieve that the former should be affected by local scrambling of the Japanese / Hungarian type, while the latter should not (e.g., Kitahara 2002, Saito 2003).

7. Concluding remarks

The main result of the present paper is that it eliminates an alleged residual idiosyncrasy of Hungarian, the non-configurationality of its VP, by providing extensive demonstration that a scrambling approach, based on a configurational vP, is empirically superior. This result has significant repercussions for the ongoing debate over the proper analysis of local scrambling. (a) Hungarian has no multiple nominative construction, hence the existence of Japanese-style scrambling cannot be put down to the structural mechanics underlying that particular construction (contra Grewendorf and Sabel 1999, Kawamura 2004) with cross-linguistic validity. (b) The availability of any number of intervening adverbs between the scrambled Obj and the Subj in Hungarian makes positioning scrambled arguments in multiple specifiers of a single projection difficult. (c) Hungarian has overt determiners (which are not amenable to an adjectival treatment, as in Slavic), hence the availability of scrambling cannot be ascribed to the absence of (overt) determiners in a language (contra e.g. Boeckx 2003, see also Bošković 2004).
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15 This also means that if ‘non-forced agreement’ (cf. Kuroda 1988) in SpecTP strictly correlates with multiply fillable SpecTP (see Miyagawa 1997, 2001, 2003, 2004), then ‘non-forced agreement’ cannot underlie this type of scrambling. If, however, ‘non-forced agreement’ is only a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for multiply filled SpecTP, then a ‘non-forced agreement’ mechanism may extend to Hungarian.
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