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Abstract
This paper investigates left dislocation constructions in Hungarian (whereby some discourse-prominent entity is placed at the left periphery of the clause, with a subsequent co-referential pronoun). Two subtypes are distinguished: a) “topic left dislocation”, which is a syntactically integrated construction, sharing properties with Germanic-type left dislocation and clitic left dislocation in certain Romance languages; b) “free left dislocation”, which is a loosely integrated structure, similar to various hanging topic left dislocations. The paper explores the structures’ morphosyntactic and semantic properties, how an LFG-theoretic account of them can be formulated as well as the cross-linguistic implications of Hungarian left dislocation.

1. Introduction
Left dislocation (LD)\(^1\) is a common label for constructions whereby some discourse-prominent entity is placed at the left periphery of the clause, with a subsequent co-referential pronoun. The term itself originates in Ross (1967), who used it for sentences like (1). As usual in the literature, “left dislocation” will be used as a descriptive label here, without commitment to a particular analysis. Furthermore, I will use the label “host” for the prominent entity itself (John in (1)) and “associated pronoun” or “pronominal associate” for the co-referential pronoun.

(1) John, I like him.

Since Ross’s original analysis, a large body of literature has emerged about LD. Some of the most notable instances are Cinque (1977), the edited volume of Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997) and Grohmann (2003). There seems to be a consensus that at least two subtypes of LD should be distinguished. In one type of LD, there is some syntactic dependency between the host and the associated pronoun and the construction itself is properly (syntactically) integrated into the containing sentence. This LD is commonly referred to as “i-type” left dislocation. The second type of LD is thought of as a looser kind of dependency. There, the host and the pronoun are only related pragmatically, and the host itself is also assumed to be in some sense less integrated into the core clause structure. This LD is usually called “n-type” left dislocation (for “non-integrated”).\(^2\) Shaer (2009: 366) (2004) illustrates the two LD-types with

\(^1\) I thank the participants of the LFG2019 Conference in Canberra for helpful suggestions. I am especially indebted to Louisa Sadler, Rachel Nordlinger and Ron Kaplan. I also thank my reviewers for their helpful comments. Naturally, any error is my responsibility.

The project no. 111918 (New approaches in the description of the grammar of Hungarian pronominals) has been implemented with the support provided from the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund of Hungary, financed under the K funding scheme.

\(^2\) López (2016) refers to this theoretical distinction as “d-type” and “h-type” dislocations.
the following German sentence pair. Similar constructions have also been reported in other Germanic languages, e.g. Dutch, Icelandic.

(2) a. Den Hans, den jeder mag.
   the.ACC Hans d-pron.ACC everyone likes
   ‘Hans, everyone likes him.’
   (German)
   (2a) is an i-type dislocation. The pronominal associate is a so-called weak d-pronoun, a kind of a demonstrative, which obligatorily matches the case of the host. In the n-type example in (2b), the associate is a personal pronoun. In addition to the obvious categorial and positional difference in (2b), there are other syntactic differences, for instance in (2b), case-matching is not obligatory. For the details of the German construction, the reader is referred to Frey (2004), the overall picture is that (2a) displays more “connectivity effects” than (2b). I will discuss related Hungarian data in the subsequent chapters. The English example in (1) (sometimes called “hanging topic left dislocation” (HTLD)) is usually analyzed as an n-type LD.

A related construction is clitic left dislocation (CLLD), which is standardly analyzed as falling into the i-type LD category. Its most obvious feature is that the pronominal associate is not a full personal or a demonstrative pronoun, but a weak form, a clitic. The Greek example in (3) is from Alexiadou (2006). CLLD has also been reported in Italian, Spanish and other Romance languages.

(3) Ton Jani, den ton ksero.
   the.ACC John.ACC NEG clitic.ACC know.1SG
   ‘John, I do not know him.’
   (Greek)

The aim of the current paper is to investigate left dislocation constructions in Hungarian and to provide LFG-theoretic analyses for them. Besides, I will put Hungarian LD into a typological perspective.

The main claims of the paper are as follows:

i) Hungarian possesses both i-type and n-type left dislocations.

ii) The i-type left dislocation in Hungarian shows properties of both Germanic LD and CLLD.

iii) The n-type left dislocation in Hungarian is best analyzed as a “syntactic orphan”, in the sense of Haegeman (1991) and Shaer (2009).

iv) Analyses consistent with the framework of LFG can be formulated about both types of Hungarian LD.

2. Left dislocation in Hungarian

Left-dislocation in Hungarian has been the subject matter of a number of papers. The most notable references are Kenesei et al. (1998), Lipták & Vicente (2009), Lipták (2010, 2012), Baloghné Nagy (2013) and den Dikken & Surányi (2017). In my discussion, I will build on these sources in terms of empirical background. However, as none of these are LFG-papers, my
theoretical perspective will be different. As for the phrase structure of Hungarian, I align myself with the account of Laczkó (2017), where the sentence is headed by an iterative S-node, dominating a “topic-field” and a subsequent “quantifier field”. Below these is the VP. The specifier of the VP may host some verbal modifier (preverb (PV in the glosses), negation, etc.) or a focussed constituent. The postverbal field has a non-configurational, flat c-structure.

(4) Hungarian clause-structure
   a. [S JánosTOP [S mindigQUANT [VP meg [V’ ette az ebédet.]]]]
      John always PV ate.3SG the lunch.ACC
      ‘John always ate the lunch.’
   b. [S JánosTOP [S mindigQUANT [VP az ebédetFOC [V’ ette meg.]]]]
      John always the lunch ate.3SG PV
      ‘It was the lunch that John always ate.’

In the following section, I will show that like other languages, Hungarian has two distinct LD-constructions. The i-type construction will be labelled “topic left dislocation” (TLD) as it is associated with (contrastive) topics and the n-type is going to be called “free left dislocation” (FLD). The latter is more flexible in terms of its syntax and information structure.

2.1. Topic left dislocation
2.1.1. Properties of TLD

The following sentence exemplifies topic left dislocation.

(5) (Szerintem) Jánost, azt, meghívuk.
    in.my opinion John.ACC that.ACC invited.1PL
    ‘(I think) John, we invited him.’

As can be seen from the example above, there is a discourse-prominent entity (Jánost ‘John.ACC’), which is followed by a demonstrative pronoun (azt ‘that.ACC’). The pair is located in the topic-field of the sentence. As the left-peripheral adverb attests, the host does not have to be absolutely string-initial, as long as it is in the topic-field. Accordingly, quantified expressions are excluded from the construction. (Note that semantic considerations would also bar such constellations, see the discussion below about the referential properties of the pronoun).

(6) *[QUANT Sok ember] az hazament.
    many person that home.went.3SG

The host element and the pronoun are usually adjacent to each other but this is not a syntactic requirement, as (7) shows.

(7) Jánost, Mari azt, meghívta.
    John.ACC Mary that.ACC invited.3SG
    ‘John, Mary invited him.’
The construction is commonly associated with the contrastive topic discourse function. However, both Lipták (2012) and Baloghné Nagy (2013) mention that there exist sentences in Hungarian with LD which are not interpreted contrastively. Following them, I also do not consider TLD as necessarily contrastive, so neutral topics may also be involved. An example for this is (8), from Lipták (2012: 289). It has to be noted that in absence of knowing the communicative context and the speaker’s intention, it is often hard to evaluate the contrastivity of a given utterance. Nevertheless, (8) does not feel contrastive at all. This is probably facilitated by the colloquial phrase “took himself and...”, which gives the impression of a simple sequence of events.\

(8) Erre Péter, azt fogta magát és elszaladt.\
then Peter that took.3SG himself and away.ran.3SG
‘Then Peter, he went and ran away.’

Various lexical classes and grammatical functions may be included in TLD. (9a) illustrates this with an oblique complement, (9b) with an infinitive and (9c) with a predicative adjective.

(9) a. A házban, [abban/ ott.] nincs senki.\
the house.to that.in there not.be nobody
‘The house, nobody is there.’

b. Enni, azt szeretek.\
eat.INF that.ACC like.1SG
‘To eat, I like doing that.’

c. Gazdag, az nem vagyok.\
rich that not am
‘Rich, I am not that.’

(9a) also shows that sometimes there is a choice with regards the demonstrative in TLD. The case-marked form of the basic demonstrative az ‘that’ is the standard option but if there is semantically matching specialized pronoun like the locative oda ‘there’ in the lexical inventory of the language, that may also be used. Thus onnan ‘from.there’, oda ‘(to) there’, etc. are also available in the appropriate contexts.

It can be said that the choice of the demonstrative basically follows the pattern of general pronoun selection of Hungarian: whatever demonstratives would be selected in non-LD contexts, such pronouns are also utilized in Hungarian TLD.

However, there are some peculiarities. As shown in (5) above, personal names may be associated with a demonstrative pronoun in Hungarian TLD. However, in non-TLD contexts, such a reference would be considered

---

3 A reviewer doubts (8) being non-contrastive. I disagree, though a lot depends on how one defines contrast. I think (8) includes a shifted topic, a new (or newly returned to) discourse referent which is different from clear cases of strong contrast, where there is an evoked set of contextually salient alternatives. For discussion of the notion of “contrast”, see Repp (2016).
infelicitous, or at least impolite (regarding John not as a person but a thing), and a personal pronoun would be the default choice.

(10) Q: Jánost hívtad meg?
 John.ACC invited.2SG PV
 ‘Is it John that you invited?’
 A: Igen, [ #az/ oti].
 yes that.ACC him
 ‘Yes, #that/ him.

However, this pragmatic infelicity is not felt in example (5), which indicates that the semantics/pragmatics of this LD-demonstrative is not completely identical to regular demonstratives.

Another point of divergence between regular demonstratives and the ones used in the TLD-contruction has to do with number agreement. Interestingly, a plural host may be also associated with a singular TLD-pronoun. Such a pattern would not be possible in regular discourse using demonstrative pronouns.4

(11) a. A fiúkat, [azt/ azokat,] meghívtuk.
 the boys.ACC that.ACC those.ACC invited.1PL
 ‘The boys, we invited them.’

b. Q: A fiúkat hívtad meg?
 the boys.ACC invited.2SG PV
 ‘Is it the boys that you invited?’
 A: Igen, [ #azt/ azokat].
 yes that.ACC those.ACC
 Approx.: ‘Yes, I invited #him/them.’

 the houses.in that.in those.in not.be nobody
 ‘The houses, nobody is in them.’

b. Q: A házakban nincs senki?
 the houses not.be nobody
 ‘Is it the houses where there aren’t anyone?’
 A: Igen, [ #abban/ azokban].
 yes that.in those.in
 ‘Yes, in #that/ those.’

The third interesting divergence from the standard usage of demonstrative pronouns is that a seemingly accusative-marked TLD-pronoun may be associated with a host that does not bear the OBJ grammatical function, as

---

4 Notably, as Tibor Laczkó pointed out to me (p.c.), this pattern also surfaces with relative pronouns, especially in spoken language.

(i) a fiúkat, akit / akitet meghívtam
 the boys.ACC whom.SG whom.PL invited.1SG
 ‘the boys whom I invited’

---
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shown in (13), from Lipták & Vicente (2009: 661). (13a) is the LD-structure and (13b) shows that the infinitival phrase must be the subject (and not the object) of the main predicate jó ‘good’.

(13) a. Úszni, az/ azt, jó volt.
   swim.INF that ACC good was
   ‘To swim, that was good to do.’

b. Jó volt [úszni/ az úszás/ *az úszást].
   good was swim.INF the swimming.NOM the swimming.ACC
   ‘Swimming was good.’

Apart from such special cases, the host and the pronominal associate show case-matching. (14) is the minimally modified version of (5). This is an instance of syntactic connectivity, noted in section 1.

(14) *János, azt, meghívtuk.
   John.NOM that.ACC invited.1PL
   Intended: ‘John, we invited him.’

Another instance of syntactic connectivity is variable binding. (15) shows that that a dislocate has no problem with being bound by a quantifier in the host clause.

(15) A kutyá-já-t, azt mindenki szereti.
   the dog-POSS.3SG.ACC that.ACC everyone likes
   ‘His (one)’s, dog, everyone likes that.’

The pronominal associate shows distal deixis by default. Proximal deixis is only possible if the host explicitly contains a proximal element. This is not a unique property of Hungarian TLD, the pattern shows up in other parts of Hungarian too, e.g. the pronominal associate of subordinate clauses is also distal by default.5

(16) *Jánost, ezt, meghívtuk.
   John.ACC this.ACC invited.1PL
   Intended, approx.: ‘John, we invited this one.’

(17) [Ezt a fiút], ezt, meghívtuk.
   this.ACC the boy this.ACC invited.1PL
   ‘This boy, we invited him.’

(18) Azt/ #ezt mondtam, hogy Jánost meghívtuk.
   that.ACC this.ACC said.1SG COMP John.ACC invited.1PL
   ‘I said that we had invited John.’

After surveying the formal properties of the pronominal, let us now take a semantic perspective. From this angle, it is a crucial question point to settle whether the associated pronoun has a PRED feature or not. That is, should it be analyzed as having some sort of a reference or it is just a grammatical formative (expletive). I argue that the answer is the former, so the pronoun has semantic load and thus, a PRED feature. The arguments are as follows.

---
5 For an overview of this construction, see Szűcs (2015).
Firstly, note the possibility of pronouns that are obviously semantically contentful, discussed in relation to (9a), *ott* ‘there’, *oda* ‘to there’, etc. The spatial reference of these is quite recognizable, which fits much better with an approach where the LD-pronoun is not devoid of semantics.

Secondly, the TLD-pronoun induces semantic/pragmatic effects which are discernible in certain contexts. Basically it requires the host to be referentially anchored. Consider the examples in (19).

(19) a. *Valaki, (az) eljött.*
   somebody that came.3SG
   ‘Somebody came.’

   b. *Valaki, (*az) van odakint.*
   somebody that is outside
   ‘There is somebody outside.’

(19a) can be interpreted if *valaki ‘somebody’* refers to some contextually available set of people. For example, such a sentence may be used in a context like “We invited many people. Some of them came, some didn’t.”. (19b) is a presentational sentence, where the reference of *valaki ‘somebody’* is newly introduced, so this anchored interpretation is not available. Accordingly, the use of the LD-pronoun is barred. Without it, (19b) is grammatical.

A similar contrast may be construed with *bárki ‘anyone’*. (20a) may be interpreted in a way that *bárki ‘anyone’* is restricted to a certain group of people. (20b), where this anchored interpretation is not available, as the meaning unrestrictedly refers to people in general, is infelicitous.

(20) a. *Bárki, (az) nem jöhet be.*
   anyone that not come.POT.3SG in
   Intended: ‘Not just anyone may come in.’ (Lit.: ‘Anyone, they may not come in.’)

   b. *Ha bárki, (*az) bejött, adtunk neki enni.*
   if anyone that in.came.3SG gave.1PL him.DAT eat.INF
   Intended: ‘If anyone came in, we gave them food.’ (Lit.: ‘If anyone, they came in, we gave them food.’)

Another indication of the semantic nature of this pronoun is its incompatibility with idiom-chunks. Consider (21).

(21) *A fene,(#az) megette ezt az egész ügyet.*
   the heck that ate.3SG this the whole issue.ACC
   ‘This whole issue is screwed.’ (Lit.: ‘The heck, that ate this whole issue.’)

(21) is an intriguing sentence, as there is an idiom chunk in the topic field, which in itself should make the sentence anomalous, in theory. (Compare: #The beans, John spilled (them).) For some reason which is not really clear to me at this point, the pronoun-less version of the sentence is acceptable, even on the idiomatic reading. Several examples of this sort may be found via internet search. Whatever the reason for this is, adding the TLD-pronoun...
makes the sentence semantically anomalous by forcing a degree of referentiality on the subject phrase a fene ‘the heck’, which it is not compatible with. It has to be noted that the force of this argument is somewhat diminished by the fact that splitting the idiom up by any means reduces the grammaticality of the sentence.

\[ (22) \text{A fene, (?már) megette ezt az egész ügyet.} \]

‘The whole issue was already screwed.’ (Lit.: ‘The heck already ate this issue.’)

However, while (22) with the interjecting már ‘already’ sounds marked, it is still not totally unacceptable, in contrast with the LD-version of (20). I take this as an indication that apart from the syntactic issue of breaking the continuity of an idiom, the semantics of the pronoun is also behind the problem in (20).

At this point it should be restated that TLD is not necessarily contrastive. This is important because otherwise one could argue that the explanation behind the data in (19)-(22) is simply the difficulty of construing contrastive readings for the sentences.

Additionally, I would like to call attention to Arregi (2003: 40), who describes similar effects in Spanish CLLD. In (23), algo ‘something’ may not be associated with the pronominal clitic lo ‘it’.

\[ (23) \text{Algo, Juan si (*lo) comió.} \]

‘Something, Juan did eat.’ (Spanish)

Arregi (2003: 40) argues that “the distribution of the clitic is determined by the interpretation of the clitic itself (...) In left dislocation, the clitic is interpreted as an individual variable”. While the proper semantic/pragmatic characterization of the TLD-pronominal is yet to be worked out, it seems to be clear that it has to be interpreted some way, which precludes an analysis where it is an empty formative.

Another question about TLD is the nature of the relationship between the host and the pronoun: which of them is the dominant participant in the sentence? Here I agree with Zaenen (1997), who argues for an analysis of Icelandic left dislocation where the pronoun is an adjunct of the host. This is the most plausible analysis for Hungarian as well. The alternative is the reversed constellation, whereby the pronoun is the argument of the main predicate and the host is an adjunct, resembling an appositive construction. While such an analysis might be plausible for some Germanic TLD-constructions,\(^6\) it is definitely not for Hungarian. To prove this, first recall the data from (13) where it is an infinitival complement that satisfies the

---

\(^6\) Frey (2004) and Alexiadou (2006) propose analyses along this path. Whether Zaenen’s (1997) analysis should be revised too is matter of further inquiry. I will explore some of the cross-linguistic and theoretical landscape of LD in section 3.
subcategorization requirement of the main predicate and not an accusative element like the LD-pronoun. Moreover, evidence for the primary status of the host over the pronoun can also be seen from object definiteness agreement patterns.

As illustrated in (24), finite verbs in Hungarian show definiteness agreement with their objects. Demonstrative pronouns count as definite objects, evidenced by (24).

    one boy.ACC see-PAST.2SG.INDEF
    ‘You saw a boy.’

b. A fiút lát-tad.
    the boy.ACC see-PAST.2SG.DEF
    ‘You saw the boy.’

    that.ACC saw-2SG.DEF see-PAST.2SG.INDEF
    ‘You saw that.’

In an LD-sentence, it is always the host and not the pronominal associate that determines the definiteness agreement of the verb. Hence in (26a) the verb shows indefinite agreement, triggered by egy fiút ‘a boy.ACC’, even though there is the demonstrative LD-pronoun in the sentence, which in principle could trigger definite conjugation. (See also den Dikken & Surányi 2017: 571-572).

(26) a. Egy fiút, azt, lát-tál.
    one boy.ACC that see-PAST.2SG.INDEF
    ‘A boy, you saw him.’

b. A fiút, azt, lát-tad.
    the apple.ACC that see-PAST.2SG.DEF
    ‘The boy, you saw him.’

2.1.2. An LFG-approach to TLD

For Icelandic LD, Zaenen (1997) proposes an analysis whereby the pronoun is regarded as an adjunct of this topical host, as shown in (27).

(27) S → XP XP V NP
    (∙TOP)=↓ (∙TOP-ADJ)=↓ ↑=↓ (∙SUBJ)=↓

Based on the considerations outlined above, I propose an analysis in a similar spirit. This is shown in Figure 1 for topic left dislocation in Hungarian, exposed via annotated phrase structure.

The pronominal associate is located in the topic-field of the Hungarian sentence, and the annotation for it should be optionally available (for details of Hungarian clause-structure, see Laczkó 2017). It is associated with some topical element, which is understood as covering contrastive and neutral topics alike.
The first line of the annotation of the TLD-pronoun is about providing its host with a "local name" (see e.g.
Dalrymple 2001: 146-148) This is a formal device that makes it possible to refer to a particular f-structure in subsequent constraints. Here it singles out one a grammatical function, which is then identified as the "host" of the TLD-pronoun. The second line constrains the host to be a topic. Following the spirit of Zaenen’s (1997) analysis, the pronoun is regarded as an adjunct of this host, as the equation in the second line of the annotation specifies. The constraining equation in line four requires this element to be an LD-pronoun. As argued earlier, I take these to be referential and their semantics should have commonalities with standard demonstratives but the data in (10)-(13) suggests that they should be treated separately. Line five requires co-reference between the host and the pronominal associate. Finally, the last line is about the case-requirements of the construction. In the default scenario, the host and the TLD-pronoun have matching case features, as evidenced by (14). Alternatively, the pronominal associate may lack a case feature, which happens for example with ott ‘there’ in (9a), or in instances where the host is not case-marked (e.g. (9b) or (13a)).

Two notes are due with respect to this last point, i.e. case. The first is that Zaenen (1997: 133) argues that case-matching follows from general rules in Icelandic, as adjuncts in Icelandic typically “agree in case marking, gender and number with the constituent they are an adjunct to”, as e.g. in (28). As (29) shows, there is no such constraint in Hungarian (the form of egyediil ‘alone’ does not vary depending on the subject), that is why the matching has to be stated separately.

![Diagram]

Figure 1.
TLD in Hungarian
The second point is that I propose to handle case-discrepancies with alternate lexical entries for the respective pronouns. This differs from the approach of Lipták & Vicente (2009) and Lipták (2012), where predicate left dislocation (e.g. (13a)) is analyzed as being the result of a process that is distinct from other instances of TLD. Lipták & Vicente (2009) propose that the accusative case on the pronoun in (13a) is the manifestation of default case in Hungarian. In my approach, the accusative case is just apparent, this alternative lexical entry of the pronoun is caseless. I consider this to be a better approach as a unitary underlying mechanism is posited for all TLD-structures in Hungarian. Moreover, it is not evident that accusative is the default case in Hungarian, see e.g. (9c), where the adjective is associated with a nominative pronoun. It is also to be noted that in (13a), the nominative pronoun is still an equally valid option, which suggests that the accusative-marking may be misleading.7

Also, in contrast to English, left-peripheral, hanging pronouns are not in the accusative case, which argues against accusative being the default in Hungarian.8

This latter construction is distinct from TLD, it is an instance of free left dislocation, to which we turn in the next section.

7 According to a reviewer, my approach is need of a stronger theoretical foundation. This may be true, but this is also true for the alternative, default case. Giving some formal substance to the theoretical notion of “default case”, would have to resort to some mechanism that ensures that such an accusative case is not the same as standard accusative case. This is likely to result in something very close to what I propose.

8 Bartos (2002, footnote 5) notes that the dative may surface in imperative root infinitives. This may also be regarded as some sort of a default case, crucially non-identical to the accusative.

(i) ?A fiúknak leülni!
the boys.DAT sit.INF
‘Boys, sit!’
A final point to make is that I assume that the LD-pronoun is specified for the person feature (3rd person), but the apparently singular one is underspecified with respect to number, which enables it to appear in sentences like (11) and (12).

2.2. Free left dislocation
2.2.1. Properties of FLD
(32) exemplifies what I label as free left dislocation (FLD).

(32) Jánost, Őt megívtuk.
John.ACC him invited.IPL
‘John, we invited him.’

In contrast to TLD, which prosodically forms a unit with the rest of the sentence, the left-peripheral element in FLD is set apart by a noticeable intonational break.

Another salient difference is that personal names are associated with personal pronouns, as one would expect in standard discourse. This feature of FLD can be most clearly explicated in conjunction with another property of the construction, the wider range of information structural categories that can be involved. In addition to the topic discourse function, the FLD pronoun can also be a focus of the main clause (first noted by Kenesei et al. 1998). This is seen in (33), where the focussed pronoun in the preverbal position pushes the preverb meg (contributing to the perfective interpretation of the sentence) to the postverbal field. In such cases, using a demonstrative like the ones in TLD triggers the sort of pragmatic infelicity demonstrated in (10) above.

(33) Jánost, Őt megívtuk [vp Őt foc / #az Őt foc [v hívtuk meg]].
John.ACC him that.ACC invited.IPL PV
‘John, we invited [HIM/#THAT].’

As for (the lack of) syntactic connectivity, consider (34), where the FLD example shows non-identical cases on the dislocate and the host. This contrasts with (14) above. (In 34a, the host is a topic, while in 34b, the host is a focus.)

(34) a. János, Őt meghívtuk.
John.NOM him invited.IPL
‘John, we invited him.’

b. János, Őt hívtuk meg.
John.NOM him invited.IPL PV
‘John, we invited him.’

The lack of connectivity may also be seen in example (35), contrasting with (15), where the binding of the (unexpressed) possessor by the quantifier is less than perfect.9

9 That sentences like (35) are not entirely unacceptable could be a result of some poorly-understood processes that make variable binding possible even when the necessary syntactic configurations do not hold. In fact, such claims have also been
Lastly, FLD contrasts with TLD in that it becomes marked if the host element is not string-initial. This obviously happens in subordinate clauses, but the same effect may appear in main clauses as well. Consider the FLD (a)- and TLD (b)-examples below.

(36) a. ?Mari Jánosnak, neki, adott ajándékot.
    Mary John.DAT him.DAT gave.3SG gift
    ‘John, Mary gave him a present.’

b. Mari Jánosnak, annak, adott ajándékot.
    Mary John.DAT that.DAT gave.3SG gift
    ‘John, Mary gave him a present.’

(37) a. ?Mondtam, hogy Jánost, Őt, meghívuk.
    said.1SG COMP John him invited.1PL
    ‘I said that John, we invited him.’

b. Mondtam, hogy Jánost, azt, meghívuk.
    said.1SG COMP John that.ACC invited.1PL
    ‘I said that John, we invited him.’

Also, (38) contrasts with (5), from section 2.1.1.

(38) ?Szerintem Jánost, Őt meghívuk.
    in.my.opinion John.ACC him invited.
    ‘I think John, we invited him.’

2.2.2. An LFG-approach to FLD

Based on the considerations above, I argue that the most plausible analysis for FLD is one where the left-peripheral entity is syntactically independent from the rest of the sentence. In other words, it is regarded as a "syntactic orphan", using the terminology of Haegeman (1991) and Shaer (2009).\(^{10}\) The relation between the host (the left-peripheral element) and the pronominal associate is like the relation between entities in two different utterances, a standard cross-sentential anaphoric dependency. This conception of FLD naturally explains the intonational break between the host and the sentence itself. Also, the use of personal pronouns in sentences like (28) is expected since they are the normal choice for such contexts. Given the pragmatic nature of the relationship, case-mismatches are also not a surprise.

Thus, from an LFG-perspective we need to find some mechanism allows a string to be analyzed as composed of independent substructures. For this, Fortmann’s (2005) proposal about parenthetical expressions may be a path forward. What he proposes is that sequences like (39) should be analyzed in a

\(^{10}\) For similar ideas, see for example Aissen (1992) and Banfield (1982). I thank one of my reviewers for these references.
way that the underlined segment is part of the c-structure of the entire expression, but it projects an independent f-structure.

(39) Theo hat – der Klempner war nicht gekommen – die Heizung repariert
Theo has the plumber had not come the heating
fixed
‘Theo has ((as) the plumber didn’t come) the repaired the heating.’

(German)

The goal of projecting an independent f-structure is achieved by using the ↓=↓ notation for the parenthetical expression, instead of the standard ↑↓ or (↑GF)=↓ equations. That is, the non-integrated element projects an f-structure, but this f-structure is not part of the f-structure of the host.

Thus, (32) should be analyzed as shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2. FLD in Hungarian](image)

The mild ungrammaticality of sentences like (36)-(38) then arguably comes from the extra-syntactic nature of the construction. This is possibly linked to processing factors, more precisely, from the difficulty of parsing phonologically intermingled independent utterances.

Finally, although such “hanging” left dislocation structures are usually associated with the topic discourse function, nothing in principle excludes other discourse functions to be associated with FLD. I will explore this and other typological aspects of left dislocation in some detail in the next section.
3. Typological considerations in left dislocation

In the previous section I gave an overview and possible LFG-theoretic approaches to left dislocation constructions in Hungarian, topic left dislocation (TLD) and free left dislocation (FLD). Now I turn to how these constructions compare to the typological landscape of LD, which was briefly outlined in the introduction.

As shown in (2), repeated here as (40), German also has two LD-constructions, which are commonly analyzed as i- and n-type left dislocations, respectively. Similar patterns have been described in Dutch and Icelandic, see the edited volume of Anagnostopoulou et al. (1997).

(40) a. *Den Hans, den, mag jeder. (German)*
   the.ACC Hans d-pron.ACC likes everyone

b. *Der/ Den Hans, jeder mag ihn,*
   the.NOM the.ACC Hans, everyone likes him

   ‘Hans, everyone likes him.’

From the discussion in the previous sections it is clear that Hungarian fits into this pattern, TLD being an i-type dislocation and FLD being an n-type one.

As such, TLD is given a syntactic analysis and it is properly integrated into the clause structure, as outlined in Figure 1. It utilizes demonstrative-like pronouns parallel to the d-pronoun *den* in (40a), with syntactic restrictions on the formal features of this pronoun.

Semantic effects of the presence of the pronominal associate are also to be observed in German. Frey (2004: 214) exemplifies such effects with the following sentence.

(41) Context: this is the children’s first day on their vacation.

   *Der Otto, (der) wollte Fußball spielen. (German)*
   the.nom Otto d-pron wanted soccer play

   ‘Otto, he wanted to play football.’

Similarly to the observed effects in (19)-(20), if the LD-pronoun is present, *Otto* must be the member of some contextually given set of children. Without the pronoun, the referent may be newly introduced into the discourse.

As noted, my analysis for TLD is similar to that of the analysis of Zaenen (1997) for Icelandic LD. Frey (2004), in a Minimalist framework, also argues for an analysis of this sort, where the left-dislocated phrase and the pronoun are independently “base-generated” and co-indexed. However, in his account, the pronoun is in a theta-position and the left-peripheral phrase is a CP-adjunct, so the functional hierarchy is the opposite of Zaenen’s (1997) and mine. As already argued in section 2.1.1, while this might be the right approach for Germanic LD, it is definitely not the one for Hungarian. Apart from the arguments already mentioned, let us also note that the LD-pronoun by itself may be fully felicitous in German given the appropriate context (as in (42a)), this is not the case in Hungarian, as the demonstrative cannot refer to a person, except in the TLD construction, see (42b). As noted earlier, without the host
Jánost ‘John.ACC’, the pronoun could only refer to some nonhuman entity. Thus an analysis where the host is an adjunct is more plausible in Germanic LD than in Hungarian.

(42) a. (Den Hans), den, mag jeder. (German)
   the.ACC Hans d-pron.ACC likes everyone
   ‘John, everyone likes him.’

   b. #(Jánost), azti, mindenki kedveli. (Hungarian)
   John.ACC that.ACC everyone likes
   ‘John, everyone likes him.’

   The CP-adjointed position of the left-peripheral element in German is supported by the fact that it can marginally occur in a pre-complementizer position in a subordinate clause, as in (43a), from Frey (2004, footnote 14). This configuration is sharply ungrammatical in Hungarian, see (43b).

   (43) a. Maria glaubt, den Hans, dass den, jeder mag.
      Mary believes the.ACC Hans COMP d-pron everyone likes
      ‘Maria believes that Hans, everyone likes him.’ (German)
      Mary believes John.ACC COMP that.ACC everyone
      likes
      ‘Mari doubts, COMP John.ACC that.ACC everyone likes
      ‘Maria doubts that Hans, everyone likes him.’ (Hungarian)

   Another divergence from the Germanic pattern is that in these languages, LD is restricted to root clauses and subordinate clauses introduced by bridge verbs Frey (2004: 226). This is not the case in Hungarian, where TLD is freer in its distribution. This is evidenced by the contrast between the German and the Hungarian data below.

   (44) a. *Maria bezweifelt, den Hans, dass den, jeder mag.
      Mary doubts the.ACC Hans COMP d-pron
      everyone likes
      ‘Maria doubts that Hans, everyone likes him.’ (German)
   b. Mari kétli, hogy Jánost, azt, mindenki szereti.
      Mary doubts COMP John.ACC that.ACC everyone likes
      ‘Maria doubts that Hans, everyone likes him.’ (Hungarian)

   These data about subordinate clauses suggest that TLD in Hungarian is closer to the core sentential domain than the Germanic LD type. This likens the Hungarian construction to clitic left dislocation (CLLD) structures (see (3) above), which are analyzed as being IP-adjuncts by Alexiadou (2006). While on our approach, there is no IP in Hungarian, the parallel is that the construction is located in the standard sentential domain, which is IP in configurational languages and S in a language like Hungarian. This gives a straightforward explanation for the contrasts in (43)-(44).

   It may be added here that since the topic field is inherently iterative in Hungarian, there is no point of talking about the host being an adjunct, in contrast to other instances of CLLD, noted above. This difference in phrase-
structural configuration may be one of the reasons why the host is able to dominate the pronominal associate in terms of functional structure.

Another CLLD-like property of TLD is that it allows for stacking, which is not possible in the Germanic type of integrated LD. Consider the data in (45)-(47), where the non-Hungarian examples are from Alexiadou (2006). (41) is an Italian sentence which shows multiple instances of CLLD. (46) is Dutch LD demonstrating the ungrammaticality of multiple LDs. The Hungarian equivalent in (47) is possible.

Thus it seems that TLD is closer to CLLD constructions than Germanic LD, as far as syntactic distribution is concerned. However, the LD-pronoun in Hungarian is not a clitic, but a demonstrative-like element, like in the Germanic type.

FLD, just like the German example in (40b), involves a loosely attached left peripheral element which is only pragmatically related to the subsequent pronominal, which then may naturally be a personal pronoun. It was described in section 2.2.1 that FLD seems to be degraded in non-initial positions. Such a degradation may be observed with regards other loose attachment-constructions as well. English hanging topic left dislocation is a standard example for these. The picture is not uncontroversial (for different perspectives, see Grohmann 2003: 139 vs. Shaer 2009: 379), it is plausible to claim that the embedded HTLD in (44) deserves a question-mark. There is a related datum in (45), which points to the same direction. There, we see that HTLD may precede but not follow topicalization, the latter being a syntactically integrated long-distance dependency. Similar data is reported in German by Grohmann (2003: 148), shown in (50). (8) would also be fully grammatical as a topicalization structure (i.e. without the pronoun associate).

(45)  *Di vestiti, a me Gianni, in quel negozio non mi ha mai comprato.  
    *clothes to me Gianni in that shop not to me has ever bought  
    ‘As for clothes, for me, Gianni has never bought them in that shop.’  

(46)  *Jan, op school, die, daar zag ik niet.  
    *John at school that there saw I not  

(47)  Jánost az iskolában azt nem láttam.  
    John, the school in that, ACC there not saw 1SG  
    ‘John, in the school, I didn’t see him there.’  

Thus it seems that TLD is closer to CLLD constructions than Germanic LD, as far as syntactic distribution is concerned. However, the LD-pronoun in Hungarian is not a clitic, but a demonstrative-like element, like in the Germanic type.

(48)  John said that Mary, he likes (?her).  

(49)  a.  ?Mary, John, he, likes.  
     b.  Mary, John, she, likes.
(50) a. *Einen Arschtritt dieser Kandidat, sollte man
     a.ACC kick-in-the-ass this.NOM candidate should one
     ihm, geben.
     him give
     Intended: ‘A kick in the ass, this candidate, one should give him.’
     (German)

     b. Dieser Kandidat, einen Arschtritt, sollte man
     this.NOM candidate a.ACC kick-in-the-ass should one
     ihm, geben.
     him give
     ‘This candidate, a kick in the ass, one should give him.’ (German)

As noted earlier, n-type LDs are commonly associated with hanging topics. However, nothing conceptually excludes other discourse functions, so potential association with focus in Hungarian FLD just fills a typologically available but unattested scenario. TLD is tied to the topic discourse function, but again this is not a necessity for i-type dislocations. Both Grohmann (2003: 145) and Frey (2004: 213) assert that German left dislocation may be used as a contrastive focus. Thus, the inventory of information structural categories for LD constructions has to be established on the basis of individual languages.

(51) Q: Have you met Anna yesterday?
     no the.ACC Martin d-pron.ACC have I yesterday
     getroffen.
     met
     (German)
     no Martin.with that.with met.1SG
     ‘No. I met Martin yesterday.’ (Hungarian)

4. Conclusion
In this paper I gave an overview of left dislocation (LD) constructions in Hungarian, with a typological outlook. I argued that Hungarian follows the cross-linguistic pattern whereby LD bifurcates into a syntactically integrated (i-type) and a non-integrated (n-type) construction.

I labelled the i-type construction of Hungarian “topic left dislocation” (TLD), given its association with (contrastive) topics. It was given an LFG-analysis in the spirit of Zaenen (1997), whereby the pronominal associate is an adjunct of its host. The characteristics of the construction follow from the phrase-structural rules and the properties of the LD-pronoun itself. While the form of the pronominal likens TLD to Germanic left dislocation constructions, its syntactic distribution is more similar to clitic left dislocation.

The n-type construction, “free left dislocation” (FLD), is claimed to be a “syntactic orphan”, an entity loosely attached to the sentence, akin to hanging topic left dislocation constructions. According to this view, the host and the
pronominial are parts of the same c-structure, but project a separate f-structure, as Fortmann (2005) proposed for parenthetical expressions.
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