

### The Hungarian Operator Raising revisited

The Hungarian construction type traditionally referred to as Operator Raising (OR, see É. Kiss 2002, Gervain 2004, Coppock 2003) is a configuration in which a constituent bearing some grammatical function semantically belongs to a subordinate clause but surfaces in the matrix sentence. The examples in (1) show various constituents involved in OR: for instance in (1a) and (1a') the subordinate subject is "raised" (and, as these examples demonstrate, the case of the raised constituent may be either accusative or nominative), (1b) exemplify a "raised" oblique. Objects may also be "raised" as in (1c). (1c') shows that with raised objects, the main verb may either have definite or indefinite conjugation

- (1) a János-t mondtad, hogy jön.  
John-ACC said.2SG that comes  
'It is John who you said that he is coming.'
- c Kutyá-t mondtad, hogy veszel.  
dog-ACC said..2SG.DEF that buy.PRES.2SG  
'It is a dog that you said you are buying.'
- a' János mondtad, hogy jön.  
John.NOM said.2SG that comes  
'As for John you said that he is coming.'
- c' Kutyá-t mondtál, hogy veszel.  
dog-ACC said.2SG.INDEF that buy.PRES.2SG  
'It is a dog that you said you are buying.'
- b Londonba mondtam, hogy megyek.  
London.INTO said.1SG that go.PRES.1SG  
'It is to London that I said I would go.'

Coppock (2003) gives an LFG account of the phenomena. She claims that the fronted element may be an athematic object of the main verb and the identification with the lower grammatical function could be either anaphoric or functional in nature. Anaphoric control must be allowed since if the raised element bears accusative case, it is a subject in the embedded clause and includes a quantified element, then the lower verb can either have 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular or 3<sup>rd</sup> plural agreement (this was first reported by Gervain 2002):

- (2) Az összes lány-t mondtad, hogy jön/jönnék.  
the all girl-acc say.PAST.2SG that come.PRES.3SG/come.PRES.3PL  
'It is all the girls that you said that they are coming.'

Since the athematic object with anaphoric identification leads to the violation of Semantic Coherence Condition (Dalrymple 2001), Coppock (2003) claims that this condition is just violable OT-style constraint.

I have two goals. First, I aim to argue that there is no need for the demotion of Semantic Coherence. I claim that the fronted element is a thematic argument of the main verb, so (2) (and 1a, 1c') is an instance of prolepsis, and akin to structures attested for instance in Madurese (Davies 2005) or Greek (Kotzoglou & Papangeli 2008). I summon arguments from the empirically tested availability of resumptive pronouns (3), idiom distribution (4), island-insensitivity (5) and from the fact that the verbs which allow OR may not be bridge verbs (6 is a canonical raising construction). Such behaviour is typical of prolepsis, as is argued by Davies (2005).

- (3) ?János-t mondtad, hogy ő jön.  
John-acc said.2sg that he comes.  
'It is John who you said that he is coming.'
- (4) #Szöge-t mondtál, hogy ütött a fejedbe az ötlet.  
nail-ACC said.2SG that hammered.3SG the head.2SG.INTO the idea  
'It is a nail that you said that the idea hit into your head.' Intended: 'You said that the idea is stuck into your head.'
- (5) Az elnök-öt mondtad, hogy hallottad a hír-t, hogy megérkezett.  
The president-ACC said.2SG that heard.2SG the news-ACC that arrived.3SG  
'It is the president that you heard the news that he has arrived.'
- (6) \*A busz-t közeledni mondtad. / A busz-t közeledni vélted.  
The bus-ACC approach.INFINITIVE said.2SG the bus-ACC approach.INFINITIVE believed.2SG  
'\*You said the bus to approach' / 'You believed the bus to approach.'

My second goal is to present some empirical data about OR and to show that discourse-structure (King & Zaenen 2004, Gazdik 2011) may provide a useful tool for describing some experimental results. I will argue that empirical data shows that in the all the shown sentences except for 1a', the discourse function of the fronted constituent may be either focus or contrastive topic, but focus is preferred. I seek to explain this by claiming that informants disprefer contrastive topic because the corresponding discourse structure would be larger than with one focus, as contrastive topic involves "splitting up the original question into implicit subquestions and answer (some of) them" (Gazdik 2011:169, quoting Büring 2003). So if the fronted element is focus in 1a it may correspond to

