The structure of the topic field in Hungarian

Lipták, A.K.; Beninca P., Munaro N.

The structure of the topic field in Hungarian

Anikó Lipták
LUCL, Leiden University

Abstract[*]

This article takes a close look at topic constituents in Hungarian concerning their use, function and structural properties. It shows that on the basis of meaning differences, intonation and lexical marking, three types of topics can be teased apart: ordinary non-contrastive topics and two types of contrastive topics. While these three types are distinct from each other in many respects, syntactically they are embodied by the same movement process. When it comes to placement, the three types occupy two specialized projections corresponding to these two types: that hosting ordinary topics and that hosting contrastive ones. This result compared to Italian indicates that languages differ in the typology of topics and structural properties of their left periphery.

1. Introduction

In the last two decades a great deal of syntactic research has been directed at the role and order of functional categories in languages, following pioneering work by Rizzi (1997) and Cinque (1999) among others. Functional categories have been identified in various languages, both in the clausal and in the nominal domains. One of the major issues concerning functional categories is their universality. The strongest position to be held here is that all languages employ the same set of functional categories, which therefore can be considered universal. Universality extends both to the number of functional projections and the relative order they occur in.

The present paper will argue that this universalist view is too strong. The functional structure found in one language might not be present in the same way in another. The argument will be based on evidence taken from the Hungarian left periphery, in comparison to that of Italian. The object of study will be the topic field, the high stretch of the left periphery that contains non-quantificational phrases that define what the sentence is about. The topic field hosts various topic constituents. This part of the left periphery in Italian has been recently given much attention in studies that have put forward a fine layer of this domain. The detailed study of Benincà and Poletto (2004) distinguishes four types of topic constituents which can co-occur in the same clause, and which line up in Italian in the order indicated in (1):[1]

(1) [Hanging Topic [Scene Setting [Left dislocation [List interpretation […FOCUS field…]]]]]

These topics differ in various properties, such as their category, their occurrence in matrix and embedded clauses, the availability or absence of resumptive elements they combine with, the kind of agreement they display with the latter, and some of their meaning components. For illustration of each type, consider (2)-(5). The topic constituent is italicized in all examples:

(2) *Mario*, non ne parla più nessuno. [Hanging Topic]
Mario not of-him talks anymore nobody
'Mario, nobody talks of him any more.'

(3) *Di Mario*, non (ne) parla più nessuno. [Left dislocation]
of Mario not of-him talks anymore nobody
'Of Mario, nobody talks of him any more.'

(4) Mario, *nel 1999*, gli hanno dato il premio Nobel. [Scene setting adverb]
Mario in.the 1999 to-him have-1PL given the prize Nobel
lit. 'Mario, in 1999, they gave him the Nobel prize.'

(5) *La frutta* la regaliamo, *la verdura* la vendiamo. [List interpretation]
the fruit it give.for.free-1PL the vegetables it sell-1PL
'We give fruit for free, while we sell the vegetables.'

In order to test the strong universalist hypothesis, which would predict that these types of topics also line up in the same order in the functional domain of other languages, in this paper I will look at the distribution of the different types of topics in Hungarian. This language provides an excellent testing ground the universalist hypothesis, as the Hungarian left periphery is quite like the Italian one in many respects. Hungarian, just like Italian, has a rich left periphery. Generative research in the last two decades (Horvath 1986, Kenesei 1986, É. Kiss 1987, 1992, Brody 1995, Puskás 2000 and Szabolcsi 1997 among others) has converged in showing that the Hungarian left periphery is partitioned into a topic field and a quantifier field in the following way:

(6) $[_{CP}$ $[_{TopP*}$ $[_{DistP*}$ $[_{FocP}$ […]]]]]

topic field quantificational field

The distinction between the two fields, as the terms themselves suggest, lies in quantificationality: the quantificational field contains A-bar constituents that are quantificational in nature, while the topic field houses elements that are non-quantificational.

In the quantificational field we find operators with scope, such as focus/*wh*-constituents, as well as various distributive quantifiers and *also/even*-phrases (*minden fiú* 'every boy', *valamennyi fiú* 'each boy', *legalább hat fiú* 'at least six boys', *több mint hat fiú* 'more than six boys', *Péter is* 'Péter, too', *még Péter is* 'even Péter'), which are moved to a unique FocP, and an iterable DistP respectively. DistP owes its name to the fact that all its occupants are necessarily distributive in this position (Szabolcsi 1997). The following example illustrates the quantificational field involving three quantificational constituents:

(7) *Még Szilvia is* *minden* *könyvet* *KÉTSZER* olvasott el /*elolvasott.
even Szilvia also every book-ACC twice read PV PV-read
'Even Szilvia read every book TWICE (as opposed to more or less often).'

The immediately preverbal constituent in small capitals is the (contrastive) focus of the sentence, whose presence is indicated by obligatory verb-preverb inversion (*el* following, rather than preceding the verb *olvasott* 'read'). Immediately to the left of the focus constituent, we find quantificational items, which are also necessarily preverbal elements. The difference between quantifiers and focus is that the former do not trigger verb-preverb inversion:

(8) *Még Szilvia is* *minden* *könyvet* elolvasott / *olvasott el.
even Szilvia also every book-ACC PV-read read PV
'Even Szilvia read every book.'

To the left of quantificational elements one can find non-quantificational phrases. These specify what the whole sentence is about. In (9), for example, the sentence initial phrase *a mai vizsgára* 'for today's exam' is what the rest of the sentence says something about:

(9) *A mai* *vizsgára* még Szilvia is minden könyvet KÉTSZER olvasott el.
the today's exam-ONTO even Szilvia also every book-ACC twice read PV
'For today's exam, even Szilvia read every book TWICE (as opposed to more or less often).'

Phrases like *a mai vizsgára* to the left of quantificational elements are collectively called *topics*. That they clearly occupy a position outside the quantificational field is evidenced by the fact that they cannot occur in between quantificational elements or occupy a position lower than these, a behaviour that also characterizes topics in Italian (Benincà 2001 and Benincà and Poletto 2004, contra Rizzi 1997):

(10) Még Szilvia is <*a mai vizsgára> minden könyvet <*a mai vizsgára>
even Szilvia also the today's exam-ONTO every book-ACC the today's exam-ONTO
KÉTSZER <*a mai vizsgára> olvasott el /elolvasott.
twice the today's exam-ONTO read PV PV-read
'For today's exam, even Szilvia read every book TWICE (as opposed to more or less often).'

The purpose of this paper is to have a look at the left peripheral distribution of such topical elements in Hungarian, and to provide insights into the functional structure that hosts them in the clause. While the semantic differences between different types of topics have been discussed extensively before (in, among others, Szabolcsi 1980, 1981, É.Kiss 1987, 1992, 2002, Kenesei 1989, Molnár 1998, Puskás 2000, Gécseg 2001, Lipták 2001, Gyuris and Novák 2001, Gyuris 2002), studies of the architecture of the left periphery that hosts them are more scarce. Our investigation will attempt to fill this gap. As I will show building on previous literature, topics can be classified into two types: contrastive and non-contrastive, and each type is hosted by a dedicated functional category. This result leads to the conclusion that Hungarian differs from Italian both concerning the types of topics that it distinguishes by phonological and syntactic means, and concerning the structure these are accommodated in.

The structure of the paper will be as follows. Section 2 provides a thorough review of non-contrastive topics in Hungarian, including their characteristic phonological, semantic and syntactic properties and position in the sentential structure. Section 3 discusses characteristics of contrastive topics, including the syntactic derivation of these constructions. Section 4 will turn to structural issues concerning the positions contrastive topics occupy, and it will argue on the basis of lexical evidence that there is a specific functional projection that hosts these, which is distinct from the projection hosting ordinary topics. Section 5 will summarize the findings and provide a comparison of the Hungarian facts with the typology (and placement) of topics in Italian.

2. Ordinary topics in Hungarian

The basic distinction between types of topics in Hungarian can be made on the basis of contrast. There are two types of topics: those that carry some kind of contrastive meaning and those that do not. In this section I will review the latter, non-contrastive type. This type is referred to as (ordinary) *topics* in the literature. The characterization in this section is primarily taken from É.Kiss (1987, 1992, 2002).

2.1. Characteristics

Topics, like the italicized constituent in (9) above, repeated here as (11) for convenience, are non-quantificational items that do not create scope and do not interact with other scope taking items (their wide existential scope is due to their referential nature).

(11) *A mai vizsgára* még Szilvia is minden könyvet KÉTSZER olvasott el.
the today's exam-ONTO even Szilvia also every book-ACC twice read PV
'For today's exam, even Szilvia read every book TWICE (as opposed to more or less often).'

Topics are pronounced with an even or a fall intonation contour and optional stress that is always less prominent than the primary stress in the sentence. Topics are not separated with a pause from the rest of the sentence and do not define an intonation phrase of their own.

Concerning their interpretation, topics indicate what the rest of the sentence is about. They are aboutness topics in the sense of Reinhart (1981). (11) states something about today's exam — namely that even Szilvia has prepared for it by reading every book twice. There can be more than one aboutness topics in one clause and these can have both old and new information status. Consider the following excerpt from a newspaper, which is the first sentence of a news item.[2]

(12) *Rembrandt H. van Rijn* 400 ÉVVEL EZELŐTT, 1606-BAN született Leidenben,

Rembrand H. van Rijn 400 year-WITH before 1606-in was.born Leiden-IN
s *ebből az alkalomból az egész világon* KIÁLLÍTÁSOKKAL emlékeznek
and this-FROM the occasion-FROM the whole world-ON exhibitions-WITH commemorate
meg róla.
PV 3SG-ABOUT
'Rembrandt H. van Rijn was born 400 years ago, in 1606 in Leiden and on this occasion exhibitions are held across the world to commemorate him.'

(12) contains two coordinated clauses. The topic of the first clause, *Rembrandt H. van Rijn* denotes new information, and it denotes the topic that this clause (as well as the whole discourse) is about. The topics of the second clause, *ebből az alkalomból* 'on this occasion' and *az egész világon* 'across the word', similarly denote what this clause is about, and it can also be noticed that they are clearly different informationally: the former denotes old information, referring back to the occasion of Rembrandt's birth, while the latter provides new information. New information topics can carry heavier stress than old information ones, and they always follow old information topics. The reverse order is not allowed, as is shown in (13):

(13) ??*s *az egész világon* *ebből* *az alkalomból* KIÁLLÍTÁSOKKAL
and the whole world-ON this-FROM the occasion-FROM exhibitions-WITH
emlékeznek meg róla.
commemorate PV 3SG-ABOUT
'and on this occasion exhibitions are held across the world to commemorate him.'

Scene setting adverbials of time and space, like *tegnap* 'yesterday' or *1999-ben* 'in 1999', can mingle with topics (both old and new information ones) in any order:[3]

(14) s *<az idén>* ebből az alkalomból *<az idén>* az egész világon *<az idén>*
and this.year this-FROM the occasion-FROM this.year the whole world-ON this.year
KIÁLLÍTÁSOKKAL emlékeznek meg róla.
exhibitions-WITH commemorate PV 3SG-ABOUT
'and on this occasion this year exhibitions are held across the world to commemorate him'

Similarly to scene setting adverbials, sentence adverbials, like *valószínűleg* 'probably' or *érdekes módon* 'interestingly', can also occur before, between and after topics.

The aboutness relation between topics and the rest of the sentence (the comment) is analyzed as an instance of a *predication* relation in É. Kiss (1992, 2002). According to this, the topic is the notional subject of predication and the comment is the predicate that says something about this topic. Their being the logical subject explains why Hungarian topics need to be referential — referential items, like definites, specific indefinites and generics can occur as topics, but non-referential items like bare-nouns or universal quantifiers are disallowed:[4]

(15) a. **Kiállítással* REMBRANDTRÓL emlékeznek meg az idén.
exhibition-WITH Rembrandt-ABOUT commemorate PV the this.year
'With exhibitions they commemorate REMBRANDT this year.'
b. **Mindenhol* Rembrandtról KIÁLLÍTÁSSAL emlékeznek meg az idén.
everywhere Rembrandt-ABOUT exhibition-WITH commemorate PV the this.year
'Everywhere they commemorate Rembrandt WITH EXHIBITIONS this year.'

The obligatory referentiality follows from topics being subjects of predication, according to É. Kiss.

Turning to syntactic properties, it can be shown that topics undergo movement and this movement is similar to that of A-bar constituents. This can be seen from the fact that topicalization observes strong islands like complex noun phrase islands, similarly to *wh*-movement (consider 16a,b) and it shows reconstruction effects (17a,b) parallel to *wh*-movement as well:

(16) a. **Ez a fiú*$_i$ hallottam a hírt, [hogy megszökött t_i]
this the boy heard-1SG the news-ACC that escaped
'I heard the news that this boy escaped.'

b. *Ki$_i$ hallottad a hírt, [hogy megszökött t_i]
this the boy heard-2SG the news-ACC that escaped
'Who is it that you heard the news that he escaped?'

(17) a. *János*$_i$ *egyik könyvét* *pro*$_{*i}$ megvette.
János-NOM one book-POSS.3SG-ACC PV-bought
'He$_i$ bought a book of János$_{*i}$'.'

b. János$_i$ melyik könyvét *pro*$_{*i}$ vette meg?
János-NOM which book- POSS.3SG-ACC bought PV
'Which book of János$_i$ did he$_{*i}$ buy?'

These facts indicate that topicalization is a movement dependency, i.e. topics are not base-generated in the left periphery of the clause.

At the same time, topicalization is not fully identical to quantificational A-bar movements like *wh*-movement or focusing. Topicalization is 'looser' than these in that it is free from certain island effects that quantificational A-bar movement is not. Such selective islands are the purpose adjunct island and existential NP-islands:[5]

(18) a. *A cipőmet*$_i$ leguggoltam [hogy bekössem t_i]. *purpose adjunct island*
the shoe-POSS.1SG-ACC PV-crouched-1SG that PV-tie-SUBJ-1SG
'My shoes, I crouched down to tie.'

b. *Mit guggoltál le [hogy bekössél t_i]?
what-ACC crouched-2SG PV that PV-tie-SUBJ-2SG
'What did you crouch down to tie?'

(19) a. *Ezt az elméletet*$_i$ nincs [aki ne ismerné t_i]. *existential NP-island*
this-ACC the theory-ACC is.not who not know-COND
'This theory there is nobody who does not know it.'

b. *Mit$_i$ nincs [aki ne ismerne t_i]?
what-ACC is.not who not know-COND
'What is such that there is nobody who does not know it?'

The differences in (18) and (19) show that topics do not share island-sensitivity with quantificational A-bar constituents in all domains. In the terminology of Puskás (2000) and É. Kiss (2002), they head a *non-quantificational* A-bar chain.

2.2. Syntactic position

As the previous section showed, topics are initial constituents that undergo movement in the syntax. In this section I look at further structural properties of topics. The question to answer is, are they hosted by a specific functional projection?

The position topics occupy is situated between the complementizer (if that is present in the clause) and the quantificational field. Their position to the left of the quantificational field was argued for in section one above (cf. (9), (10)). Their placement with respect to the finite complementizer *hogy* 'that' is shown in (20).

(20) Azt hallottam, hogy *Rembrandt* 400 ÉVVEL EZELŐTT született.
that-ACC heard that Rembrandt 400 year-WITH before was.born
'I heard it was 400 years ago that Rembrandt was born.'

While it is clear that topics occupy a well-defined position in the left periphery, it is not a priori clear whether this position is projected by a dedicated functional projection, as in (21), or it is an adjunction position of sorts, as in (22).

(21) [$_{CP}$ *hogy* [$_{TopP}$ *topic(s)* [$_{DistP/FocP}$ ...]]]

(22) [$_{CP}$ *hogy* [$_{DistP/FocP}$ *topic(s)* [$_{DistP/FocP}$ ...]]]

Unlike in Japanese, where topics are marked by a special morpheme *wa* (Kuno 1973), which can be assumed to fill the functional Top^0 head, Hungarian does not have any morphological (or phonological) marker associated with topics. This has led many scholars to assume that in fact there is no functional projection specialized for hosting topics in Hungarian. Instead, topics are *adjoined* to the highest syntactic category they c-command. Ideas to this effect can be found in Marácz (1989), where the highest category is identified as CP, as well as in Brody (1990), where it is TP. In present-day theorizing, these accounts translate as adjunction to FocP or DistP, in case the highest quantificational element in the left periphery is a focus or a distributive quantifier respectively.

Adjunction-based proposals are inferior, however, to a treatment in terms of a dedicated TopP, when it comes to predicting the distribution of certain adverbials in the left periphery, as É. Kiss (1992) showed. (22) is incapable of making a distinction between the distribution of sentence adverbials and predicate adverbials among topic and focus constituents. To illustrate this, consider the behaviour of predicate adverbials like *teljesen* 'fully, completely' in (23). They can only occur lower than topics (23a), but not higher (23b):

(23) a. Rékában *teljesen* JÁNOS bízik meg.
Réka-IN fully János trusts PV
b. **Teljesen* Rékában JÁNOS bízik meg.
fully Réka-IN János trusts PV
'It is János who trusts Réka fully.'

Sentence adverbials, like *szerintem* 'according to me' on the other hand, can occupy both positions freely: both to the right and to the left of topics, without any change in meaning.

(24) a. Rékában *szerintem* JÁNOS bízik meg.
Réka-IN according.to.me János trusts PV
b. *Szerintem* Rékában JÁNOS bízik meg.
according.to.me Réka-IN János trusts PV
'According to me, it is János who trusts Réka.'

Now, in a model in which both topics and adverbials are adjoined to a functional category like FocP (cf. 22), there is no way of coding the difference between the behaviour of predicate adverbials and sentence adverbials. If topics can adjoin to FocP, we have to assume that predicate adverbials and sentence adverbials can adjoin to this projection, too, as (25) shows.

(25) a. [$_{FocP}$ Szerintem [$_{FocP}$ Rékában [$_{FocP}$ szerintem [$_{FocP}$ JÁNOS ...]]]] *sentence adv*.
b. [$_{FocP}$ * [$_{FocP}$ Rékában [$_{FocP}$ teljesen [$_{FocP}$ JÁNOS ...]]]] *predicate adv*.

Adjoining topics to the highest quantificational projection thus does not provide structural means to capture the difference between sentence adverbials and predicate adverbials. With a structure in which topics occupy the specifier of a separate, dedicated functional projection, TopP in (21), this problem does not arise. In such a representation, sentential adverbials are free to occur either as adjoined to FocP or to TopP, while predicate adverbials always adjoin to FocP:

(26) [$_{TopP}$ sentence adverbial [$_{TopP}$ topic [$_{FocP}$ sentence/predicate adverbial [$_{FocP}$ focus ...]]]]

The placement of these adverbials thus favours an analysis that makes use of a special functional position for ordinary topic phrases.[6] As É.Kiss (1992) further illustrates, a representation of topics as constituents in a special projection also makes the right prediction about phonological properties of topic constituents. Since focus always receives the nuclear stress of the sentence, while topics do not, the phonology-syntax mapping can be done more easily if these two constituents are structurally

distinct.

With these arguments in place, I take the existence of a dedicated TopP projection for ordinary topic constituents to be well-established. In the next sections, I turn to properties and structural positions of contrastive topics in Hungarian.

3. Contrastive topics

The topics discussed in the previous section were non-contrastive: none of the examples above indicated, explicitly or implicitly, some kind of contrast with respect to another element. Topics with a contrastive meaning do exist in Hungarian, but they have lexical, phonological and syntactic properties distinct from ordinary topics as is described in a sizeable amount of literature (Szabolcsi 1980, 1981, Hunyadi 1981, É. Kiss 1987, 1992, 2002, Molnár 1998, Puskás 2000, Alberti and Medve 2000, Gyuris and Novák 2001, Lipták 2001, Gyuris 2002, 2004).

Topics with a contrastive meaning come in two varieties: one type *implies* contrast and another one *explicitly states* it. In the discussion here, I follow the above literature in characterization, and Lipták (2001) specifically treating the two types separately. While the literature uses diverse denominations, I will stick to the term *left dislocation* for the type with implied contrast and the term Contrastive Topics for the type with explicit contrast. In the present section, I will turn to these contrastive topics in turn.

3.1. Implied contrast: left dislocation

3.1.1. Lexical, phonological and semantic properties

One type of contrastive topic is pronounced with a special intonation that involves optional stress and (fall)-rise intonation on the topic. This kind of intonation (which will be marked by / in the examples) typically marks the end of an intonation phrase and can be followed by a slight pause. I will call contrastive topics with this kind of intonation *left dislocated* phrases, due to the fact that they show properties of being *dislocated* to the left of the clause they occur in: next to the topic it is possible to have a demonstrative pronominal (*az* 'that')[7] associated with it in reference that acts as a resumptive double. The left dislocated constituent needs to be suitably case-marked, corresponding to the case of the argument it represents:

(27) /*Péternek* (annak) EGY KÖNYVET adott Anna.
Péter-DAT that-DAT a book-ACC gave Anna
'As for Péter, Anna gave him a BOOK (while to others, something else might apply).'

The demonstrative item occurs exclusively in a high position (cf. 28a), adjacent to the contrastive topic (cf. 28b) and agrees with the contrastive topic in person, number and case when the topic is a nominal phrase.[8]

(28) a. /*Péternek* EGY KÖNYVET adott (*annak) Anna.
Péter-DAT a book-ACC gave that-DAT Anna
'As for Péter, Anna gave him a BOOK (while to others, something else might apply).'
b. /*Péternek* (??Anna) annak EGY KÖNYVET adott.
Péter-DAT Anna that-DAT a book-ACC gave
'As for Péter, Anna gave him a BOOK (while to others, something else might apply).'

In the use of this demonstrative associate, the Hungarian data closely resemble *contrastive left dislocation* in German, which similarly uses case-marked demonstrative pronouns as associates (Grohmann 2003):

(29) *Diesen Satz,* den mag ich besonders.
this-ACC sentence that-ACC like I especially
'This sentence, I like especially.'

Similarly to German, Hungarian left dislocation is also contrastive. The use of left dislocation implicates contrast with a discourse referent already introduced or to be introduced later. The informational surplus that contrast provides is to indicate that the topic constituent has alternatives for which the same predicate might not hold. Consider (27) again, repeated here as (30):

(30) /*Péternek* (annak) EGY KÖNYVET adott Anna.
Péter-DAT that-DAT a book-ACC gave Anna
'As for Péter, Anna gave him a BOOK (while to others, something else might apply.).'

(30) asserts the same proposition as (31), where *Péter* is in an ordinary (non-contrastive) topic, but in addition to asserting (31), (30) also implies that there exists some other individual in the domain of discourse, of whom the predicate *Anna gave a BOOK to him* might not hold.

(31) Péternek EGY KÖNYVET adott Anna.
Péter-DAT a book-ACC gave Anna
'Anna gave a BOOK to Péter.'

It is clear that the contrastive value of left dislocation as opposed to ordinary topicalization is an implication (but not an entailment). Reference to alternatives is not part of the truth conditions of the sentence (Szabolcsi 1980, Gyuris 2002): a sentence like (30) can be used equally well in a situation in which the speaker knows that other individuals got something else from Anna (say, Mary a ball, Kinga a diary and Pisti a pen) or when (s)he has no knowledge about what happened to other individuals, and (s)he wants to leave open the possibility that they got something else.

Another characteristic property of left dislocations is that they always need to be followed by a constituent bearing a falling pitch accent (marked as \), like a focus constituent, negation or an emphatic quantifier (Molnár 1998, Gyuris 2002), which I will refer to as *emphatic operators*. All examples above contain a focused item following the left dislocated topic. The following examples show that negation or emphatic quantifiers also license left dislocation:

(32) a. / *Péternek* (annak) \ nem adott Anna egy könyvet.
Péter-DAT that-DAT not gave Anna a book-ACC
'As for Péter, Anna did not give him a book (while to others, something else might apply).'
b. / *Péternek* (annak) \ mindenki egy könyvet adott.
Péter-DAT that-DAT everybody a book-ACC gave
'As for Péter, everybody gave him a book (while to others, something else might apply).'

The presence of an emphatic operator is required in German left dislocation as well, and there it is usually a focus constituent that carries the falling pitch. According to von Fintel (1994), Büring (1997), van Hoof (2000) and Gyuris (2002), the obligatory presence of an emphatic constituent is the semantic consequence of the particular contrastive meaning left dislocation brings about: the emphatic operator is necessary to arrive at the right presupposition that is associated with the left dislocate. For more on this topic, see the references cited above.

Another characteristic property of Hungarian left dislocated constituents is that they need not be referential. Non-referential bare nominals or universal quantifiers are perfect left dislocates, as is shown in (33) (compare in this respect (15a,b) in section two above):[9]

(33) a. /*Biciklit* MARI kapott.
bike-ACC Mari got
'As far as bikes are concerned, it was Mari who got one (while to others something else might apply).'
b. /*Mindenki* nem jött el.
everybody not came PV
'As for everybody, it is not true that they all came (while to a smaller set of people, it

is true).'

In line with this, left dislocation can involve categories other than nominals alone. The left dislocate can be a PP, an AP or a VP as well (for more on VP-topicalization, see Lipták and Vicente 2005):

(34) a. /*Péter mellett*, (a mellett) nem állt senki. [PP]
Péter next that next not stood nobody
'As for next to Péter, there was nobody standing next to him (while to others something else might apply).'

b. /*Szép*, (az) nem vagyok. [AP]
beautiful that not be-1SG
'As far as being beautiful is concerned, I am not beautiful (but as for other qualities, I might have those).'

c. /*Gyorsan úszni*, (azt) nem tud Péter. [VP]
quickly swim-INF that-ACC not able Péter
'As for swimming quickly, Péter cannot do that (while to other things something else might apply).'

3.1.2. Syntactic properties

Turning to syntactic properties now, first and foremost it needs to be seen how left dislocated constituents are positioned. Are they generated inside or outside their clause, and what kind of relation do they entertain with the rest of the clause? In this section, I am going to show that they are clause-internal and that they undergo movement from clause-internal position to the left periphery.

First of all, left dislocation can appear in embedded contexts, both in finite clauses (É.Kiss 1987) and in some non-finite ones (Alberti and Medve 2000) (35a,b). If left dislocation is extra-sentential, it should be excluded in embedded contexts. Another serious blow for an extra-sentential analysis comes from the fact that topic constituents can be found *to the left* of left dislocated items, both in main clauses (35c) and in embedded ones (Molnár 1987) (35a):

(35) a. Mari tagadta, hogy Anna /*Péternek*, (annak) EGY KÖNYVET adott.
Mari denied that Anna Péter-DAT that-DAT a book-ACC gave
'Mari denied that as for Péter, Anna gave him a BOOK (while to others, something else might apply.)'

b. ez az a lány, aki /*Péternek*, (annak) EGY KÖNYVET adott
this that the girl who Péter-DAT that-DAT a book-ACC gave
'this is the girl, who, as for Péter, she gave him a BOOK (while to others, something else might apply.)'

c. Anna /*Péternek*, (annak) EGY KÖNYVET adott.
Anna Péter-DAT that-DAT a book-ACC gave
'As for Péter, Anna gave him a BOOK (while to others, something else might apply.'

Given that topic phrases, like *Anna* in (35a,c), undergo movement (recall section 2.1 above), the left dislocated phrase to the right of the topic must be a sentence-internal constituent.

It must be mentioned that the above data clearly set Hungarian left dislocation aside from Hanging Topic (HT) constructions. Hanging Topics are a frequent dislocation strategy in Romance and Germanic languages (Benincà and Poletto 2004, Grohmann 2003). Hanging Topics are clause-external constituents that share some properties with left dislocations, but are uniquely different from those in important respects. While both types have a resumptive pronominal double, the double is different in the two cases both in its shape and position: as a rule of thumb, it can involve strong pronouns or epithets in the case of HT, and weak pronouns or clitics in the case of left dislocation. The position of the pronouns is lower with HT than with LD. The pronominal furthermore shows agreement only with a subset of features not including case features in the case of HT, while it agrees with the full set in the case of LD. The Hanging Topic itself is restricted in another way as well: it can only be a DP, but no other category. Last but not least, true instances of HT are restricted in some types of embedded

clauses, like relative clauses:

(36) a. *una persona che *questo libro* non ne parlerà mai [Hanging Topic]
a person who this book not of-it talk-FUT any.more
'a person, who will not talk about this book any more'
b. una persona che di *questo libro* non ne parlerà mai [left dislocation]
a person who of this book not of-it talk-FUT any.more
'a person, who will not talk about this book any more'

A quick run-through of the above characteristics indicates that Hungarian left dislocation does not pattern with Hanging Topics. First, unlike Hanging Topics, the Hungarian left dislocate needs to be properly case-marked (cf. 27) and can be of any lexical category (cf. 34). The left dislocated item has a pronominal double that agrees in case with it (cf. 27) and which can only occupy a left peripheral position (cf. 28a). The whole construction can be embedded also in relative clauses (cf. 35b), unlike Hanging Topics (36a). Last but not least, Hungarian left dislocation can be recursive (Gyuris and Novák 2001), given an appropriate discourse context, as (37) shows.[10] (38) illustrates that the latter property is not true of Hanging Topics in Italian:

(37) [Who met whom this week?]
a. /*Anna* /*hétfőn* PETERREL találkozott.
Anna Monday-ON Péter-WITH met
'As for Anna, as for Monday, she met PÉTER (while to others on other days, something else might apply).'
b. /*Anna* (?az) /*hétfőn* (?akkor) PÉTERREL találkozott.
Anna that Monday-ON (then) Péter-WITH met
'As for Anna, as for Monday, she met PÉTER (while to others on other days, something else might apply).'

(38) **Gianni, questo libro,* non gliene hanno mai parlato [Hanging Topic]
Gianni this book not to.him-of-it have any.more talked
'They did not talk to Gianni about this book.'

The conclusion thus has to be drawn that Hungarian left dislocation clearly does not instantiate an Italian-German-type Hanging Topic construction. Hungarian in fact has no Hanging Topics of any kind, including 'as for' topics.

Returning now to syntactic properties of left dislocations, we have seen so far that left dislocated phrases in Hungarian do not seem to be outside their clause, according to the evidence of their free embeddability and their position to the right of (non-base-generated) topics (cf. 35). The same conclusion can be drawn by observing the combination of locality properties and reconstruction effects.

As (39) shows, left dislocation is subject to the same island effects as topicalization (see section 2 before). Left dislocation cannot apply across CNP islands (39a), but can apply across purpose clause adjunct islands and complex NP islands in existential contexts:

(39) a. */*Miklós*$_i$ az nem hallottam a hírt, [hogy megszökött t_i]
Miklós that not heard the news-ACC that escaped
'As for Miklós, I did not hear the news that he escaped (while to others, something else might apply).'
b. /*A cipőmet*$_i$ azt nem guggoltam le [hogy bekössem t_i].
the shoe-POSS.1SG-ACC that-ACC not crouched PV that PV-tie-SUBJ-1SG
'As for my shoes, I did not crouch down to tie them (while to some other things, something else might apply).'
c. /*Azt az elméletet*$_i$ azt nincs [aki ne ismerné t_i].
that-ACC the theory-ACC that-ACC is.not who not knew-COND
'As for that theory, there is nobody who does not know it (while to some other things, something else might apply).'

These island facts point to the conclusion that some constituent has undergone movement of the topicalization type in these clauses from a clause-internal position (indicated by t_i). At this point we have three a priori candidates for the movement step: (i) the left dislocated topic moves on its own, and the resumptive is base-generated in a high position (40a); (ii) the resumptive item moves on its own and the left dislocated item is base-generated high (40b); (iii) they both move together as a constituent (40c), assuming there is only one position where the two can originate from:[11]

(40) a. $[\text{LD}]_i$ [az] $[_{\text{CP}}$ t_i] *left dislocated element moves*
b. [LD] $[\text{az}]_i$ $[_{\text{CP}}$ t_i] *resumptive moves*
c. $[[\text{LD}]\ [\text{az}]]_i$ $[_{\text{CP}}$ t_i] *both move as a constituent*

To decide which scenario obtains, we need to see if there is any evidence that the LD originates inside the CP. One possibility to explore are connectivity effects. In the example constructed in (41), an R-expression is placed inside a left dislocate phrase. As the judgment shows, this R-expression cannot be coreferential with a pronominal lower in the clause, indicating that the left dislocated DP originates below the latter in the position of t_j:

(41) / *Viktor*$_i$ *egyik könyvét*$_j$ azt *pro*$_{*i}$ nem vette meg t_j.
Viktor-NOM one book-POSS.3SG-ACC that-ACC not bought PV
'As for a book of Viktor$_i$'s, he$_{*i}$ did not buy that (while to some other thing, something else might apply).'

Binding principle A effects are also observable in a similar fashion. An object anaphor in left dislocated position can and has to be coreferential with the subject internal the clause:

(42) /*Önmagát*$_i$ azt nem tartotta sokra Károly$_i$.
him/herself-ACC that-ACC not considered much-ON Károly
'As for himself, Károly did not consider himself worthy (while to others, something else might have applied).'

Connectivity effects like these — to the extent they can be taken to indicate that movement has taken place (see Sharvit 1999 for exceptions) — indicate that the left dislocated item undergoes movement to the left periphery from a clause-internal position to which it can (and has to) reconstruct back to. Movement of the resumptive element alone (in the scenario in (40b)) would not give us this result. The example in (41) is instrumental in showing precisely this. In this example, *az* is coreferential with the whole DP but not with the possessor within that, while it is precisely this possessor R-expression that causes a binding principle violation with a coreferential subject due to reconstruction of the left dislocated phrase. This shows that (40b) cannot be on the right track, and only (40a) or (40c) are possible scenarios.

Of these two, (40a) can be discarded on conceptual grounds: it would be unattractive to take the resumptive to start out as a base-generated left peripheral element, while its antecedent undergoes movement from a lower position, for the reason that resumptives originate in argument positions, not in left peripheral ones. This leaves us with (40c): in this scenario both the left dislocated topic and the resumptive item undergo movement.

Following Aoun, Choueiri and Hornstein (2001) and Boeckx (2003), I put forward the claim that — at least in the cases of DP-left dislocation at hand — left dislocate and resumptive can move together because they form a constituent in the base: the resumptive item is generated as an appositive modifier to the left dislocated item in Hungarian.[12] The appositive relationship results in coreference between the two, and accounts for case-sharing and phi-feature agreement between the two. From the internal position, where the big DP is selected by the verb, it undergoes movement to the left periphery as one constituent:

(43) a. $[[\text{LD}]\ [\text{az}]]_i$ $[_{\text{CP}}$ t_i] = (40c)
b. $[_{\text{DP}}\ [_{\text{DP}}$ Viktor$_i$ egyik könyvét] $[_{\text{DP}}$ azt$]]_j$ *pro*$_{*i}$ nem vette meg t_j.

Viktor-NOM one book- POSS.3SG-ACC that-ACC not bought PV
'As for a book of Viktor$_i$'s, he$_{*i}$ did not buy that (while to some other thing, something else might apply).'

Assuming that left dislocate and resumptive preferably stay together as a complex constituent in the left periphery, too, this analysis easily accounts for the observed adjacency between left dislocate and resumptive that was noted in (28b) above, repeated here as (44):

(44) /Péternek (??Anna) annak EGY KÖNYVET adott.
Péter-DAT Anna that-DAT a book-ACC gave
'As for Péter, Anna gave him a BOOK (while to others, something else might apply).'

Adjacency falls out from the apposition structure in (43): *Péternek* and *annak* form one constituent that cannot be broken up by other material.

Note that the proposed analysis in terms of a complex DP containing both dislocate and resumptive is not itself new. Both É.Kiss (1987) and Alberti and Medve (2000) make a similar statement concerning the adjacency in (28). They claim that the resumptive is adjoined to the dislocate and forms a complex phrase with it in the left periphery. What my account adds to this picture is direct evidence that the complex formation takes place in the base and is followed by a movement step of topicalization into the left periphery.[13]

With this added, the nature of this topicalization construction has been fully uncovered it involves regular movement of a complex phrase. The exact target of this movement will be identified in section 4 below, after the introduction of the other contrastive topic type in the next section.

3.2. Explicit contrast: Contrastive Topics

3.2.1. Lexical, phonological and semantic properties

In addition to left dislocation, Hungarian has another way of expressing contrast on a topic constituent. While left dislocated constituents have a special (fall-)rise intonation, the other type of contrastive topics have no intonational surplus when compared to ordinary non-contrastive topics. Rather, contrastive meaning is indicated by contrastive lexical elements, which I will refer to as *contrastive particles* (C-PRT in the glosses). Topics that can appear with these particles will be called Contrastive Topics (CT)[14], to differentiate them both from left dislocation and from Topics, and from the term contrastive topic, which describes both left dislocation and Contrastive Topics as a cover term. The example in (45) shows a typical example of a sentence with a Contrastive Topic. The Contrastive Topics are italicized in both clauses:

(45) Anna *regényt* olvas, *novellát* viszont nem.
Anna novel-ACC reads short.story-ACC C-PRT not
'Anna reads novels, short stories, on the other hand, she does not read.'

When it comes to intonation, the topic constituents *regényt* 'novel-ACC' and *novellát* 'short.story-ACC' are intonated exactly as ordinary Topic elements, with even or falling intonation, and without a pause following them. As can also be seen from the example, Contrastive Topics are not linked to a resumptive pronominal that follows them, similarly to ordinary topics, and unlike left dislocation.

Interpretation-wise, Contrastive Topicalization is similar to left dislocation in that the conveyed meaning is contrastive. Unlike left dislocation, however, the contrast in this case is not only *implied* but *explicitly stated* (entailed). To observe this, compare two examples, one with left dislocation (cf. 46a), and one with a Contrastive Topic (cf. 46b):

(46) a. Anna /*novellát* nem olvas. *left dislocation*
Anna short.story-ACC not reads
'As for short stories, Anna does not read them (while to things, something else might apply).'

b. Anna *novellát* viszont nem olvas. *Contrastive Topic*
Anna short.story-ACC C-PRT not reads
'Anna on the other hand does not read short stories (as opposed to other things she does read).'

As the difference in the translations reveals, left dislocation only implies that there *could* be things other than short stories for which the proposition 'Anna does not read x' is false. The example with a Contrastive Topic on the other hand explicitly states that there *are* things of which this proposition is false. Felicitous use of (46b) furthermore requires that alternatives of which this proposition is false be named in a previous contrast clause or sentence, as, for example, in (45) (see also (51) below).

The obligatorily explicit contrast in the case of Contrastive Topics can be further illustrated by the following comparison. Unlike ordinary topics, Contrastive Topics cannot be used in clauses which are identical in their predicate. For the sake of illustration, imagine a context in which a teacher is listing what each of his students did last week. In this context, example (47), involving ordinary topics is a perfect way of rendering the fact that both Anna and Péter read Hamlet:

(47) *Anna* elolvasta a Hamletet, *Péter* elolvasta a Hamletet.
Anna PV-read the Hamlet-ACC Péter PV-read the Hamlet-ACC
'Anna read Hamlet, Péter read Hamlet.'

The same kind of situation, however, cannot be expressed by topics that are associated with contrastive particles (48a), due to the fact that these particles require predicates that are minimally distinct from each in the two clauses. For example, they differ in their object, as in (48b).

(48) a. **Anna* elolvasta a Hamletet, *Péter* viszont elolvasta a Hamletet.
Anna PV-read the Hamlet-ACC Péter C-PRT PV-read the Hamlet-ACC
'Anna read Hamlet, Péter on the other hand read Hamlet.'
b. *Anna* elolvasta a Hamletet, *Péter* viszont elolvasta az Othellót.
Anna PV-read the Hamlet-ACC Péter C-PRT PV-read the Othello-ACC
'Anna read Hamlet, Péter on the other hand read Othello.'

As a result of their contrastive meanings, Contrastive Topics — similarly to left dislocation — are only licensed in clauses where they are followed by an emphatic operator, a constituent with a falling pitch accent, like focus, negation or an emphatic quantifier (see section 3.1.1). (46) above illustrated a case in which Contrastive Topics are licensed by negation (verum focus). (49) shows a case where a lexical focus is present. In (49a), focus falls on the object of the verb, (49b) on the whole VP.

(49) a. *Anna* \ REGENYT olvas, *Péter* viszont \ NOVELLAT.
Anna novel-ACC reads Péter C-PRT short.story-ACC
'Anna reads NOVELS, Péter on the other hand reads SHORT STORIES.'
b. *Anna* \ [olvasta a Hamletet], *Péter* viszont \ [úszott].
Anna read the Hamlet-ACC Péter C-PRT swam
'Anna was reading Hamlet, Péter on the other hand was swimming.'

As far as topicalizable phrases are concerned, Contrastive Topics need not be referential entities. As the following examples show, non-referential elements or universal quantifiers can be Contrastive Topics:

(50) a. *Korcsolyát* ANDRÁS kapott, *biciklit* viszont MARI.
skate-ACC András got bike-ACC C-PRT Mari
'Skates were given to ANDRÁS, bikes on the other hand to MARI.'
b. *Húszan* befférnek a terembe, *mindenki* viszont nem fér be.
twenty PV-fit the hall-INTO everybody C-PRT not fit PV
'Twenty people fit into the room, everybody on the other hand does not.'

Before turning to syntactic properties of Contrastive Topics, mention must be made about the peculiarities of contrastive particles that Contrastive Topics associate with. So far I only illustrated *viszont* 'on the other hand' in the previous examples, but in addition to this element, Hungarian has a handful of other contrastive particles that can be used to express contrast on a topic constituent: *ugyan* 'while', as well as *azonban/pedig/meg* 'on the other hand'. These particles differ in their stylistic value (ranging from the most literary *azonban* to the informal *meg*) as well as the precise syntactic environment in which they can be used. With respect to the latter, the first and foremost distinction is that *ugyan* can only occur in the first clause of coordinated clauses, while *viszont/azonban/pedig/meg* can only occur in the second (or, if there are more, the last) clause or sentence:

(51) a. $[_{CP1}$ [CT] {*ugyan*} …], $[_{CP2}$ [CT] …]
b. $[_{CP1}$ [CT] …], $[_{CP2}$ [CT] {*viszont / azonban / pedig / meg*} …]

In addition to this distinction, there are subtle differences to be found between *viszont/azonban* vs. *pedig/meg* with respect to what kind of emphatic operators they can associate with. While the former can occur with any kind of emphatic operator, the latter cannot be followed by a positive verum focus:

(52) *Regényt* nem olvas Anna, *novellát* viszont/azonban/*pedig/*meg igen.
novel-ACC not read Anna short.story-ACC C-PRT yes
'Anna does not read novels, short stories on the other hand she reads.'

Contrastive particles are always linearly adjacent to the topic they refer to. Breaking up the topic-particle sequence leads to serious degradation in grammaticality. In the following sentence, where *pedig* is intended to be construed with *novellát* 'short.story-ACC', the temporal adverbial phrase cannot intervene between the two:

(53) Anna *regényt* olvas néha, *novellát* (??a héten) pedig nem.
Anna novel-ACC reads sometimes short.story-ACC the week-ON C-PRT not
'Anna reads novels sometimes, short stories on the other hand she does not read this week.'

This adjacency property will become important in section 4.2 below, where I turn to the structural position of these contrastive particles. In the following section I continue describing Contrastive Topics by turning to hitherto unmentioned syntactic properties of these constructions.

3.2.2. Syntactic properties

With respect to syntactic properties, Contrastive Topics pattern with other types of topics. They can be embedded under any matrix predicate (cf. (20) and (35a,b) above):

(54) Mari tagadta, hogy *Anna* REGÉNYT olvas, *Péter* viszont NOVELLÁT.
Mari denied that Anna novel-ACC reads Péter C-PRT short.story-ACC
'Mari denied that Anna reads NOVELS, and Péter on the other hand reads SHORT STORIES.'

Also, similarly to topics and left dislocations, Contrastive Topics are not unique. There can be more than one Contrastive Topic in a clause (compare (37) above):

(55) *Anna tegnap* REGENYT olvasott, *Péter* <viszont> *ma* <viszont> NOVELLAT.
Anna yesterday novel-ACC read Péter C-PRT today C-PRT short.story-ACC
'Anna, yesterday, read NOVELS, Péter, today, on the other hand read SHORT STORIES.'

It has to be noted that for the majority of my informants grammaticality seriously degrades when each Contrastive Topic is followed by a contrastive particle on its own, be it the same or a different particle:

(56) a. ??**Anna tegnap* REGENYT olvasott, *Péter* viszont *ma* viszont NOVELLAT.
Anna yesterday novel-ACC read Péter C-PRT today C-PRT short.story-ACC

b. ??*Anna tegnap* REGÉNYT olvasott, *Péter* azonban *ma* viszont NOVELLÁT.
Anna yesterday novel-ACC read Péter C-PRT today C-PRT short.story-ACC
'Anna, yesterday, read NOVELS, Péter, today, on the other hand read SHORT STORIES.'

The pattern preferred by most speakers is to have one contrastive particle per clause, and as far as I could ascertain, it does not matter if that particle follows the first or the second topic, if there are more.

Turning to locality and reconstruction effects, it can be seen that these also give results parallel to other types of topics, as the reader can ascertain by comparing to the following examples with (16-19), (39) and (41-42) above:

(57) a. [I heard the news that Tibor escaped...]
*Miklós$_i$ viszont nem hallottam a hírt, [hogy megszökött t$_i$]
Miklós C-PRT not heard-1SG the news-ACC that escaped
' Miklós on the other hand, I did not hear the news that he escaped.'
b. [I tidied my trousers...]
A cipőmet$_i$ viszont nem guggoltam le [hogy bekössem t$_i$].
the shoe-POSS.1SG-ACC C-PRT not crouched-1SG PV that PV-tie-SUBJ-1SG
'My shoes on the other hand I did not crouch down to tie.'
c. [My theory is completely unknown...]
Azt az elméletet$_i$ viszont nincs [aki ne ismerné t$_i$].
that-ACC the theory-ACC C-PRT is.not who not knew-COND-3SG
'That theory on the other hand, there is nobody who does not know it.'

(58) a. [He bought many new books...]
Viktor$_i$ egyik könyvét$_j$ viszont *pro*$_{*i}$ nem vette meg t$_j$.
Viktor-NOM one book-ACC C-PRT not bought PV
'A book of Viktor$_i$'s on the other hand, he$_{*i}$ did not buy.'
b. [He venerated his boss...]
Önmagát$_i$ viszont nem tartotta sokra Károly$_i$.
him/herself-ACC C-PRT not considered much-ON Károly
'Himself on the other hand, Károly did not consider worthy.'

These test cases indicate that, just like ordinary topics and left dislocations, Contrastive Topics undergo movement to the left periphery. In section 4, I turn to the question of what position the target of this movement is.

4. The structural position of contrastive topics

4.1. Initial considerations

Section 2.2 above established (following É. Kiss (1992)) that the position of ordinary topic phrases in Hungarian is a dedicated functional projection under the complementizer layer (cf. 21), repeated here as (59):

(59) [$_{CP}$ [$_{TopP*}$ *topic(s)* [$_{DistP/FocP}$ ...]]]

The question now is, do contrastive topics also occupy a dedicated functional projection and if so, where can this be found?

The fact that contrastive topics presumably occupy the specifier of a dedicated projection instead of being adjoined to some other category can be demonstrated using the same argument that was also employed for ordinary topics in section 2.2 above. This showed that the distribution of predicate adverbials and sentence adverbials is easier to capture if contrastive topics occupy a dedicated position. The facts for contrastive topics are exactly the same as in the case of ordinary topics (cf. 23-24). While predicate adverbials occur to the right of left dislocated items, sentence adverbials can either precede or follow them:

(60) a. /Rékában abban *teljesen* JÁNOS bízik meg.
Réka-IN that-IN fully János trusts PV
b. **Teljesen* /Rékában abban JÁNOS bízik meg.
fully Réka-IN that-IN János trusts PV
'It is János who trusts Réka fully.'

(61) a. /Rékában abban *szerintem* JÁNOS bízik meg.
Réka-IN that-IN according.to.me János trusts PV
b. *Szerintem* /Rékában abban JÁNOS bízik meg.
according.to.me Réka-IN that-IN János trusts PV
'According to me, it is János who trusts Réka.'

The same facts can be replicated for Contrastive Topics as well. The distribution of adverbials thus favours an analysis that makes use of a special functional position for contrastive topics, which I will dub C(ontrastive)TopP:

(62)[$_{\text{CTopP}}$ sentence adv. [$_{\text{CTopP}}$left dislocate / Contrastive Topic [$_{\text{FocP}}$ sentence/predicate adv. [$_{\text{FocP}}$...]]]]

By assuming such a category, a proper distinction can be made between the two types of adverbs on the basis of the category they can adjoin to. Interestingly, the existence of a special contrastive topic functional projection can be further evidenced by morphological considerations, as the next sections will show. As will be argued, the position of contrastive particles seems to be precisely the head of this functional projection.

Before turning to arguments to this effect, the current section will settle two more questions, concerning CTopP. First, is it distinct from TopP? Second, are there two distinct CTopP phrases — one for left dislocation and one for Contrastive Topics — or does the same position host both?

The answer to the first question is clearly positive, for conceptual reasons. It was shown earlier in this paper that both ordinary topics and contrastive topics get to the left periphery by movement. At the same time, ordinary topics and contrastive topics clearly differ in an important meaning component, the presence or absence of contrast with alternatives. A recent trend in left periphery research (started with Beghelli and Stowell (1997), Szabolcsi (1997)) attributes differences in meaning (as well as the location in parametric variation) to the content of *functional structure*, rather than to the elements that move to it. Following this trend, I have to assume that TopP and CTopP are distinct projections, because the meaning of the elements they host are distinct.[15] The semantic content of TopP can be defined as an aboutness relation (conceived as a predication relation, as in É. Kiss' works). The semantic content of CTopP on the other hand is more than just aboutness: it is that of invoking contrast, with respect to other alternatives of the topic phrase.

Therefore, the two functional categories, TopP and what I called CTopP above, seem to be distinct. The minimal distinction between them is that the latter contains a feature <contrast> which is missing from the host of ordinary non-contrastive topics, as can be seen in (63).

(63) a. [$_{\text{TopP}}$ [$_{\text{Top'}}$ Top^{0}] *functional structure hosting topics*
b. [$_{\text{TopP}}$ [$_{\text{Top'}}$ Top$^{0}_{\text{[+contrast]}}$]] *functional structure hosting contrastive topics*

The projection in (63b) is what I will continue to call CTopP.

TopP and CTopP can be co-existent in a clause, as is shown by the fact that non-contrastive topics and contrastive topics can freely co-occur with each other. The order of the two types of topic is quite free, but the unmarked order of the two is topics > contrastive topics (Gécseg 2001). The following examples illustrate this (underlying indicates ordinary topics, italics indicates contrastive ones):

(64) a. Anna /*Péternek*, annak (?Anna) EGY KÖNYVET adott.
Anna Péter-DAT that-DAT Anna a book-ACC gave
'As for Péter, Anna gave him a BOOK (while as for others, something else might apply).'
b. Ágnes *regényt* ugyan (?Ágnes) nem olvas, de novellát igen.
Ágnes novel-ACC PRT Ágnes not reads but short.story-ACC yes
'Ágnes does not read novels, whereas short stories, she reads those.'

This shows that TopP and CTopP can freely vary, with the contrastive CTopP 'tending' towards a lower position in the topic field than TopP:

(65) $[_{CP}\ [_{TopP}\ [_{CTopP}\ \ldots\ (?[_{TopP*}\ )\ [_{quantificational\ field}\ \ldots\ ]]]]]$

The tendency for CTopP to occur as last in the row of topics is arguably due to the way Hungarian positions contrastive elements. As Molnár (2002) among others has shown, contrast is a property of various left peripheral items: it can characterize both topics and focus constituents. In Hungarian, contrast and focus are closely related concepts: focused phrases in the left periphery are always contrastive. Assuming that contrast thus characterizes the lower, quantificational field of the sentence, too, the behaviour of contrastive topics to occur as close to this domain as possible can be understood.[16]

Having seen that TopP and CTopP are different projections, I can turn now to the question of whether left dislocations and Contrastive Topics occupy the same or different positions in the topic field. The fact that they can co-occur, preferably in the order Contrastive Topic > left dislocation, as shown in (66), is not telling, since we have seen in (37) and (55) above that left dislocations and Contrastive Topics are recursive.

(66) [Béla liked all candidates...]
a. Zoltán viszont /*a titkárnőjelöltet* (azt) nem venné fel.
Zoltán C-PRT the secretary-candidate-ACC that-ACC not hire-COND PV
'Zoltán on the other hand would not hire the secretary-candidate.'
b. ?/*A titkárnőjelöltet* (azt) Zoltán viszont nem venné fel.
the secretary-candidate-ACC that-ACC Zoltán C-PRT not hire-COND PV
'Zoltán on the other hand would not hire the secretary-candidate.'

A more telling example is (67), where we find a contrastive particle that characterizes Contrastive Topics in combination with left dislocated elements (the latter showing special (fall-)rise intonation and a resumptive element):

(67) Anna *regényt* (azt) olvas, /*novellát* (azt) viszont nem.
Anna novel-ACC that-ACC reads short.story-ACC that-ACC C-PRT not
'Anna reads novels, short stories, on the other hand, she does not read.'

While a bit verbose, the sentence is grammatical.[17] Examples like these are used to emphasize the contrast.

Examples like (67) therefore provide key evidence for treating left dislocations and Contrastive Topics alike in the syntax. As I have shown in the previous section (a summary of which can also be found in Table 1 below in section 5), left dislocations and Contrastive Topics share almost all their properties, except for phonological marking and the use of lexical material (resumptives vs. particles), which are ways of marking distinct types of contrast. (Fall-)rise intonation and the use of resumptives is implied contrast, the presence of overt contrastive particles is explicit contrast. For reasons of parsimony, the two types can be conflated into one, and can be accounted for assuming the same position, CTopP in the left periphery, as shown in (65). To provide more support for (65), the next sections will show that the functional head of this CTopP is arguably filled by overt material, the contrastive particles themselves.

4.2. The role of contrastive particles

The present section shows that contrastive particles, which played a crucial role in identifying Contrastive Topics, are most likely to be spell-outs of a functional head in the left periphery, that which hosts contrastive topic constituents. The argumentation will start first by showing that they have head-like properties in the syntax (section 4.2.1.) and it will then proceed to elaborate on the gains of analyzing them as the head of CTopP (section 4.2.2).

4.2.1. The category of contrastive particles

In order to gain insight about the syntactic position of contrastive particles, we need to ask what the categorial status of these words is. While the category of particles is in general notoriously difficult to establish, in the case of these particles there are some properties that make them look more like syntactic heads with a functional role than some specifier material (XPs).

The first of these is that they cannot bear focal stress. While the Contrastive Topic they accompany can bear stress, it is impossible to stress the particles themselves (` indicates major stress that is carried by focused constituents):

(68) *Ágnes *regényt* `ugyan nem olvas, de novellát igen.
Ágnes novel-ACC C-PRT not reads but short.story-ACC yes
'While Ágnes does not read novels, she reads short stories.'

If these particles are functional heads, this behaviour is expected.

Secondly, these particles cannot be modified by any means, which similarly points to their head status:

(69) Ágnes *regényt* {*éppen / *pontosan} ugyan nem olvas, de novellát igen.
Ágnes novel-ACC just exactly C-PRT not reads but short.story-ACC yes
'While Ágnes does not read novels, she reads short stories.'

Third, these items (with the exception of *meg*) are homophonous with sentential coordinators that have a meaning close to *de* 'but'. To illustrate their use as clausal coordinators, consider the sentences in (70). As (70c) shows, *meg* cannot be used as a clausal coordinator:

(70) a. Péter a boltba indult, *viszont* 10 percen belül a kocsmában kötött ki.
Péter the shop-INTO left but 10 minute-ON WITHIN the pub-IN ended up
'Péter left for the shop, but he ended up in the pub.'
b. Péter a kocsmában kötött ki, *pedig* a boltba indult.
Péter the pub-IN ended up while the shop-INTO left
'Péter ended up in the pub, while he left for the shop.'
c. *Péter a kocsmában kötött ki, *meg* a boltba indult.
Péter the pub-IN ended PV *meg* the shop-INTO left
'Péter ended up in the pub, while he left for the shop.'

As can be seen in these examples, the contrastive coordinators precede the whole clause (including the topic layer). This initial position is clearly not the position that contrastive particles occupy in our examples with Contrastive Topics. In those examples, the particles are always found right after the topic, in which position the particle moreover has a different meaning from that of a *but*-kind clausal coordinator. Notice the meaning difference between the following two examples: [18]

(71) a. Anna REGÉNYT olvas, pedig *Péter* NOVELLÁT. [coordinator *pedig*]
Anna novel-ACC reads C-PRT Péter short.story-ACC
'Anna is reading a NOVEL, contrary to the fact that Péter is reading SHORT STORIES.'
b. Anna REGENYT olvas, *Péter* pedig NOVELLAT. [particle *pedig*]

Anna novel-ACC reads Péter C-PRT short.story-ACC
'Anna is reading a NOVEL, Péter on the other hand read SHORT STORIES.'

Another argument to show that particles to the right of topics are not coordinators can be given with the help of embedded contexts. If these particles were clausal coordinators, we would not expect them to surface in subordinated contexts. Yet they freely occur there. (72) shows this for an embedded finite argument clause and (73) shows a particle occurring inside a relative clause.

(72) Azt mondják, hogy Anna REGÉNYT olvas, Péter *pedig/meg* NOVELLÁT.
that-ACC say-3PL that Anna novel-ACC reads Péter C-PRT short.story-ACC
'They say that Anna reads NOVELS, Péter on the other hand reads SHORT STORIES.'

(73) Mindenki az igazgatót kereste, aki *viszont* szabadságon volt.
everyone the director-ACC searched REL-who C-PRT holiday-ON was
'Everyone was looking for the director, who on the other hand was on holiday.'

These examples demonstrate that contrastive particles are not coordinators in syntactic contexts where they accompany a Contrastive Topic. The fact that the particle *meg* cannot function as a contrastive coordinator at all (cf. 70c), reinforces this view.

At the same time, the fact that contrastive particles double as contrastive coordinators can give us a handle concerning their categorial status. One the one hand, assuming, together with Kayne (1994) and Johannessen (1998), that coordinators themselves are X^0 categories[19], we are warranted to take these particles to be heads and not XPs. Secondly, it is not unreasonable to think that contrastive particles have resulted from a grammaticalization process in which the clausal coordinators have lost some ingredients of their original meaning, and retained others (like contrast). If I am on the right track in assuming that such a grammaticalization process has taken place, this can provide further evidence for the functional status of particles, as grammaticalization gives rise to functional material.[20]

These arguments taken together suggest a treatment of contrastive particles that places them in the functional structure of the left periphery, occupying a head position. Given that contrastive particles are always adjacent to a contrastive topic (cf. (53) above, repeated here as (74)), the simplest assumption is to take these heads to head the functional projection that hosts the topic in its specifier position, as indicated in (75) (much in the vain of Poletto and Zanuttini this volume):

(74) Anna *regényt* olvas néha, *novellát* (??a héten) viszont nem.
Anna novel-ACC reads sometimes short.story-ACC the week-ON C-PRT not
'Anna reads novels sometimes, short stories on the other hand she does not read this week.'

(75) $[_{\text{CTopP}}$ contrastive topic $[_{\text{CTop'}}$ C-PRT^0 [...]]

The alternative treatment would adjoin both the topic and the particle to some lower projection in the left periphery. This treatment, however, would make it more difficult to explain the adjacency between the two.

4.2.2. Contrastive coordinators as spell-out of a topic head

By analyzing contrastive particles as spell-outs of a dedicated topic functional head, several facts fall into place. Next to the observed adjacency in (74), the proposed structure in (75) is advantageous for other reasons as well, most notably, for reasons of selection. As I noted in section 3.2.1 above, contrastive particles are lexical elements with certain selectional properties. Selection affects different parts of the structure. On the one hand, these particles are sensitive to what focal environment is found to their right: *viszont/azonban* allow for positive verum focus while *pedig/meg* do not (cf. (52), repeated as (76)):

(76) *Regényt* nem olvas Anna, *novellát* viszont/azonban/*pedig/*meg igen.
novel-ACC not read Anna short.story-ACC C-PRT yes
'Anna does not read novels, short stories on the other hand she does.'

As selectional restrictions characterize heads, rather than XPs, these facts provide further motivation to take contrastive particles to be heads. Selectional restrictions do not stop in the above, though. Contrastive particles are also selective as for what kind of syntactic element instantiates the contrastive topic on their left. A good example to show this is *wh*-pronouns. In their indefinite meaning (similar to 'some'), these elements can occur in the position of contrastive topics. The particles that can follow them, however, are *pedig/meg* and not *viszont/azonban*:

(78) Ki A BOLTBA ment, ki pedig/meg/*viszont/*azonban A PIACRA.
who the shop-INTO went who C-PRT the market-ONTO
'Some went to the shop, the others to the market.'

Such selectional restrictions are easily captured by a configuration in (75). Since the particle and the contrastive topic are in spec-head configuration, selectional restrictions can be expressed by feature checking that takes place between the particle and the topic constituent.

I take the above pieces of evidence concerning adjacency and selectiveness to argue for the head nature of these particles. If these heads are the spell-out of a contrastive topic functional head, the contrastively topicalized constituent is arguably hosted in the specifier of such a projection.

The picture we arrive at then is that the Hungarian topic field in the high left periphery contains the functional projection CTopP, whose specifier can be filled with contrastive topic constituents. Taking the results of the previous section into consideration as well, CTopP can hosts both Contrastive Topics (in which case $CTopP^0$ is spelled out as a particle) or left dislocations (in which case the head of CTopP is left unfilled):

(79) a. $[_{CTopP}$ topic $[_{CTop'}$ *viszont/azonban/pedig/meg* [...]] 'Contrastive Topics'
b. $[_{CTopP}$ /topic $[_{CTop'}$ Ø [...]] left dislocations

Ø in the case of left dislocations stands for an unfilled $CTop^0$. The contrast in this case is indicated by the intonational surplus that the left dislocate has. As (67) showed, intonation on the topic and contrastive particles can also be combined in some cases, arguing that there is no structural difference between the two types of topics.

4.3. Interim summary

In this section I have argued that a dedicated Contrastive Topic projection (CTopP) is always projected whenever the left periphery of Hungarian contains a contrastive topic constituent, be it a left dislocate or a Contrastive Topic. If the present argumentation is on the right track, the head of this projection can be filled with overt particles (giving rise to explicit contrast), which provides evidence for such a Contrastive Topic phrase. It was also shown that this Contrastive Topic tends to occur to the right of TopP, which hosts ordinary topics:

(80) $[_{TopP*}$ (ordinary) topic(s) $[_{Top'}$ $[_{CTopP*}$ contrastive topic(s) $[_{CTop'}$ {C-PRT / Ø } [...]]]]

5. Summary of findings and comparison with Italian

Having seen the behaviour of Hungarian topics in the previous sections, in this section I take stock of the key properties of topic constituents and offer a comparison with Italian.

Concerning topic types on the basis of characteristic properties, Table 1 presents a list of properties that differentiate topic types in Hungarian, splitting these into contrastive topics and non-contrastive ones.

Table 1. Properties of topic types in Hungarian

	non-contrastive	*contrastive*	
	Topics (both old and new information)	left dislocation	Contrastive Topic
(fall-)rise intonation	*	✓	*
association with a resumptive element	*	✓	*
association with a particle	*	(✓)	✓
can be non-referential	*	✓	✓
must be followed by emphatic operators	*	✓	✓
recursive	✓	✓	✓
can be embedded	✓	✓	✓
derived by movement	✓	✓	✓

As is clear from this table, all Hungarian topics are recursive, can be embedded and are derived by movement to the left periphery from a clause-internal position. These syntactic properties are inherent to all constituents that are topical in nature. It could be said therefore that *syntactically* Hungarian has only one kind of topicalization process: a movement strategy that raises the topic to a position that is embedded under the complementizer layer.

While syntactically topics have the same derivation, differences between them can be found in their semantics as well as their phonology and/or lexical marking. Phonological/lexical marking is linked to the semantics: it marks contrast. Non-contrastive topics are unmarked both in phonology and via lexical means. Contrastive topics, on the other hand are marked: left dislocations are marked in phonology ((fall-)rise intonation), and are typically associated with a demonstrative pronominal in apposition to them. Contrastive Topics are unmarked in phonology, but marked via lexical means, by being associated by contrastive particles. The semantic difference between left dislocation and Contrastive Topics lies in the nature of contrast (implied and entailed respectively). Non-referentiality and association with emphatic operators, which characterize both types of contrastive topic are due to the contrastive nature of topics (cf. É.Kiss 2002, Gyuris 2002).

With such an array of characteristic properties in hand, we can now compare the Hungarian facts to the typologically unrelated language, Italian. In what follows, this will be done in the light of Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) and Benincà and Poletto (2004).

5.1. Comparison with Italian in the light of Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007)

In a recent work, Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) put forward a semantico-functional typology of Italian topics, according to which there are three types of topic constituents in Italian: (i) shifting or aboutness topics, which denote new or newly introduced information; (ii) familiar topics, which denote already established referents, and (iii) contrastive topics, which introduce alternatives. Of these three types, each is associated with a particular syntax (and phonology). Aboutness topics and contrastive topics are syntactically much alike: they are both left peripheral (in the order aboutness topics > contrastive topic), they are both resumed with a clitic pronoun, and they are both non-recursive. Familiar topics on the other hand are typically realized in the right periphery, optionally associate with clitics and are recursive.

As we have seen in this paper, Hungarian topics can fulfil all three functions: aboutness, familiar and contrastive use. Compared to Italian, however, the syntax and the lexical/phonological marking of these topics are different in Hungarian. This language treats aboutness topics and familiar topics alike: they both appear in the left periphery as ordinary topics with the same phonological and syntactic properties, and they do not appear with a resumptive element, unlike aboutness topics in Italian. Familiar and new information topics can only be distinguished from each other with respect to their order: as examples (12)-(13) showed, new information topics precede old information ones. Contrastive topics in Hungarian pattern with their Italian counterparts in that they follow aboutness topics, but concerning the way contrast is expressed, Hungarian makes a distinction between left dislocations and Contrastive Topics, a distinction that is not made in Italian.

5.2. Comparison with Italian in the light of Benincà and Poletto's (2004)

Another detailed account of Italian topics, Benincà and Poletto (2004), proposes a typology that classifies topics according to their syntactic characteristics. They identify four types of topic constituents in Italian that differ from each other in their syntax as well as some ingredients of interpretation: Hanging Topics, scene setting topics, left dislocations and so-called list interpretation topics (recall the structure in (1) above). In this typology, neither one of the four types is specifically contrastive (although some of them are capable of expressing contrast).

Section 3.1.2 demonstrated that of these four types, Hanging Topic-like constructions are not found in Hungarian. While left dislocated constituents might strike one as Hanging Topics at first sight, they are recursive constituents, properly case-marked and can occur in embedded contexts, none of which characterizes Hanging Topics in Italian (or, concerning the last property, not in all contexts).

Properties such as being case-marked, recursive and embeddable characterize left dislocations in Italian, too, yet Hungarian left dislocations differ from these in some respects as well: (i) Italian left dislocations use clitics as resumptives, while Hungarian uses strong pronouns (demonstratives); (ii) the resumptives are obligatory in Italian for left dislocated objects, while they are always optional in Hungarian, and (iii) Italian left dislocation is non-contrastive, while Hungarian left dislocation is contrastive, as described in section 3.1.1 above. These properties clearly indicate that what are called left dislocations in Italian and Hungarian are different constructions.

Of the other two types of topics in Benincà and Poletto's (2004) typology, scene setting adverbs also exist in Hungarian. But the two differ substantially in their distribution with respect to other topics. Scene setting adverbs in Hungarian can both precede and follow non-contrastive topics (cf. 14 above), while Italian scene setting adverbs, according to initial investigations in Benincà and Poletto (2004), always occur to the left of left dislocations, which are not specifically contrastive, either, similar to non-contrastive topics in Hungarian.

The last type of topic, list interpretation topics in Italian are elements involved in pair-list contrast, as illustrated in (81):

(81) *La frutta* la regaliamo, *la verdura* la vendiamo. [List Interpretation]
the fruit it give.for.free-1PL the vegetables it sell-1PL
'We give the fruit for free, while we sell the vegetables.'

For the expression of such pair-wise contrast Hungarian uses Contrastive Topics followed by contrastive particles, like in (82).

(82) *A gyümölcsöt* elajándékozzuk, *a zöldséget* pedig eladjuk.
the fruit-ACC give.for.free the vegetable-ACC C-PRT sell
'The fruit we give for free, the vegetable on the other hand, we sell.'

Yet, List interpretation topics and Contrastive Topics are different in the two languages in that the expression of pair-wise contrast is unique in Italian (cf. (83), Paola Benincà, p.c.) but recursive in Hungarian (see also 55 above):

(83) ?**A suo figlio, la frutta* la sbuccia, *a sua figlia, la verdura* la cucina.
to her son the fruit it peels to her daughter the vegetables it cooks
'For her sun, she peels the fruit and for her daughter she cooks the vegetables.'

(84) *A fiúknak a gyümölcsöt* meghámozza, *a lányoknak a zöldséget* viszont megfőzi.
the boys-DAT the fruit-ACC peels the girls-DAT the vegetable-ACC C-PRT cooks
'(S)he peels the fruit for the boys, and she cooks the vegetables for the girls.'

It seems therefore that the typology of Hungarian topics is different from that of Italian ones. The two languages have different sets of topics at their disposal and they express these with different means.

5.3. A universal left periphery?

The conclusion reached here has a consequence that goes beyond the study of two particular languages alone. Given that Hungarian and Italian differ in the expression of topics in the above listed ways, it seems unlikely that the topic field in these languages contains the exact same kind of functional projections, in the same order in both languages, as hypothesized by the universalist approach to the cartography (originating from Rizzi 1997). According to this approach, the left periphery consists of several positions, which are universal both in the sense that every natural language has them and in the sense that they occur in a fixed order.

As I have shown in this paper, while the Italian high left periphery contains four different slots for topic constituents to the left of the focus field (in Benincà and Poletto (2004), cf. 85), Hungarian possesses no more than two (iterable) functional categories, an iterable position for ordinary Topics, and a similarly iterable position for contrastive topics (cf. 86).

(85) [Hanging Topic [Scene Setting [Left dislocation [List interpretation [$_{\text{focus field}}$ ...]]]] [Italian]

(86) [$_{\text{TopP*}}$ topic(s) [$_{\text{CTopP*}}$ contrastive topic(s) [$_{\text{CTop'}}$ {C-PRT / Ø } [$_{\text{quantificational field}}$ ...]]] [Hungarian]

The differences in (85) and (86) do not only pertain to the labels of each projection (which are obviously arbitrary), but also to the *content* of the functional heads hypothesized to exist: none of the functional projections proposed for Italian carries over to those proposed for Hungarian. Take, for example, left dislocation: while the projection hosting left dislocates should include the property [+contrastive] in Hungarian, should not contain the same property for Italian. Similarly, the projection for list interpretation in Italian cannot be the same as the one hosting contrastive topics in Hungarian, on the one hand because of differences in contrastiveness, and on the other, because such a projection is iterable in Hungarian but not in Italian.[21] This shows that the functional projections themselves are not the same in the two languages, suggesting that it is wrong to assume that the topic field is organized along a universal template of topic positions.

The facts can of course be made compatible with the kind of universalist view that allows for the existence of templates from which languages can select (or activate) some, but not necessarily all projections. In the case of the topic field under study, this would mean that the universal template needs to contain all the distinct topic projections we have evidence of from Italian and Hungarian, i.e. we need to take the union of the set of projections found in Italian and the set of projections found in Hungarian. This would give us a template that contains, in some yet unspecified order, the following types of functional projections:

(87) (i) a functional projection for Hanging Topics
(ii) a functional projection for Scene Setting topics
(iii) a functional projection for left dislocations (non-contrastive)
(iv) a functional projection for list interpretation topics (non-contrastive)
(v) a functional projection for ordinary topics
(vi) a functional projection for contrastive topics

In this view, Italian and Hungarian would come out differently on the surface, due to the fact that Italian would activate functional projections (i)-(iv), and Hungarian would activate (v)-(vi). The problem with this kind of proposal, however, is that it is by definition unfalsifiable. The list in (87) can be added to endlessly: every time a new functional projection is identified in a language, it can be argued to be part of the universal template that need not be fully activated in all languages. Needless to say, such a theory would be highly unattractive for its lack of explanatory adequacy.

References

Alberti, G. and A. Medve (2000) Focus constructions and the „scope-inversion puzzle" in Hungarian. In G. Alberti and I. Kenesei (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian VII*. Szeged: JATE Press: 93–117.

Aoun, J., L. Choueiri and N. Hornstein (2001) Resumption, movement and derivational economy. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 371-403.
Beghelli, F. and T. Stowell (1997) Distributivity and Negation. In A. Szaboolcsi (ed.), *Ways of scope taking*. Dordrecht: Reidel: 71-107.
Benincà, P. and C. Poletto (2004) Topic, focus and V2. In L. Rizzi (ed.), *The structure of CP and IP*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 53-75.
Brody, M. (1995) Focus and Checking Theory. In I. Kenesei (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian V*. Szeged: JATE Press: 29-44.
Boeckx, C. (2003) *Islands and chains.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Büring, D. (1997) *The Meaning of Topic and Focus. The 59th Street Bridge Accent.* London, New York: Routledge.
Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and functional heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
den Dikken, M. (2006) Either-float and the syntax of co-*or*-dination. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24, 3: 689-749.
Frascarelli, M. and R. Hinterhölz (2007) Types of Topics in German and Italian. In S. Winkler and K. Schwabe (eds.), *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins: 87-116.
Gécseg, Zs. (2001) A kontrasztív topik szintaxisáról és szemantikájáról. [About the syntax and semantics of contrastive topics.] *Magyar Nyelv*. XCVII/4: 283-293, 423-432.
Grohmann, K. (2003) *Prolific domains*. *On the anti-locality of movement dependencies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Gyuris, B. (2002) The semantics of contrastive topics in Hungarian. Doctoral dissertation, Eötvös Loránd University.
Gyuris, B. (2004) A new approach to the scope of contrastive topics. In B. Shaer, W. Frey, C. Maienborn (eds.), *Proceedings of the Dislocated Elements Workshop, ZAS Berlin, November 2003*. *ZASPiL* 35: 133-156.
Gyuris, B. and A. Novák (2001) A topik és a kontrasztív topik [The topic and the contrastive topic]. In L. Kálmán et al (ed.), *Magyar leíró nyelvtan: Mondattan I. Segédkönyvek a nyelvészet tanulmányozásához VI.* [A Descriptive Grammar of Hungarian: Syntax I. Resource books for the study of linguistics VI.]. Budapest: TINTA Könyvkiadó: 24-53.
van Hoof, H. (2000) The rise in the rise-fall contour: does it evoke a contrastive topic or a contrastive focus? Ms., Universität Tübingen.
Horvath, J. (1986) *Focus in the Theory of Grammar and the Structure of Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Hunyadi, L. (1981) A nyelvi polaritás kifejezése a magyarban. [The expression of linguistic polarity in Hungarian.] Doctoral Dissertation, Debrecen: Lajos Kossuth University.
Johannessen, J. B. (1998) *Coordination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
É. Kiss, K. (1987) *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
É. Kiss, K. (1992) Move-alpha and scrambling in Hungarian. In I. Kenesei (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian IV*. Szeged: JATE Press: 67-98.
É. Kiss, K. (1994) Sentence structure and word order. In F. Kiefer and K. É. Kiss (eds.), *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian. Syntax and Semantics 27*. San Diego, London: Academic Press: 1-90.
É. Kiss, K. (2002) *The syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
von Fintel, K. (1994) *Restrictions on Quantifier Domains*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
Kadmon, N, (2001) *Formal Pragmatics.* Malden, Mass./Oxford: Blackwell.
Kayne, R, (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Kenesei, I. (1986) On the logic of word order in Hungarian. In W. Abraham and S. de Meij (eds.), *Topic, Focus and Configurationality*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 143-159.
Kenesei, I. (1989) Logikus-e a magyar szórend? [Is Hungarian word order logical?] *Általános nyelvészeti tanulmányok* XVII: 105-152.
Kenesei, I. (1992) On Hungarian Complementizers. In I. Kenesei (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian IV*. Szeged: JATE Press: 37-50.
Kenesei, I. (1994) Subordinate clauses. In F. Kiefer and K. É.Kiss (eds.), *The syntactic Structure of Hungarian*. Syntax and Semantics 27. San Diego/London: Academic Press: 275-354.
Kenesei, I., R. Vago and A. Fenyvesi (1998) *Hungarian*. London/New York: Routledge.
Kiefer, F. (1967) On emphasis and word order in Hungarian. Bloomington, USA: Indiana University Press.
Krifka, M. (1989) Nominal reference, temporal constitution and quantification in event semantics. In R. Bartsch (ed.), *Semantics and Contextual Expression*. Dordrecht: Foris: 75–115.
Kuno, S. (1973) *Japanese grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Lipták, A. (2001) *On the syntax of wh-items in Hungarian*, LOT dissertation series 45.

Lipták, A. and L. Vicente (to appear) Pronominal doubling under topicalization. In I. Kenesei and A. Lipták (eds.), *New perspectives on the left periphery in Hungarian*. Special issue of *Lingua*.
Marácz, L. (1989) *Asymmetries in Hungarian*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Groningen.
Molnár, V. (1998) Topic in focus. On the syntax, phonology and pragmatics of the so-called "contrastive topic" in Hungarian and German. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 45, 1-2: 89-166.
Molnár, V. (2002) Contrast — from a contrastive perspective. In H. Hasselgård, S. Johansson, B. Behrens and C. Fabricius-Hansen (eds.), *Information Structure in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi: 147-161.
Poletto, C. and R. Zanuttini (this volume) Sentential Particles and Remnant Movement.
Puskás, G. (2000) *Word order in Hungarian. The syntax of A-bar positions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Reinhart, T. (1981) Pragmatics and linguistics: an analysis of sentence topics, *Philosophica* 27: 53-94.
Rizzi, L. (1997) The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer: 281-337.
Sharvit, Y. (1999) Connnectivity in Specificational Sentences. *Natural Language Semantics* 7: 299-341.
Surányi, B. (2004) The left periphery and cyclic spell-out: the case of Hungarian. In D. Adger, C. De Cat, G. Tsoulas (eds), *Peripheries*. Dordrecht: Kluwer: 49-73.
Szabolcsi, A. (1980) Az aktuális mondattagolás szemantikájához. [About the semantics of the actual sentence partitioning] *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 82: 59-83.
Szabolcsi, A. (1981) The semantics of Topic-Focus articulation. In J.A.G. Groenendijk, T.M.V. Janssen, M.B.J. Stokhof (eds.), *Formal methods in the study of Language*. Amsterdam: Matematisch Centrum: 513-541.
Szabolcsi, A. (1981) Compositionality in Focus. *Folia Linguistica* 15: 141–61.
Szabolcsi, A. (1997) Strategies for scope taking. In A. Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of scope taking*. Dordrecht: Kluwer: 109-154.

[*] I am grateful to the editors of this volume for their invitation to this publication as well as for their comments on the previous versions of this material. I would also like to thank two anonymous reviewers who supplied valuable comments on the manuscript. This work is supported by *NWO* (*Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research*).

[1] The glosses in this paper are as follows: ACC = accusative; DAT = dative; C-PRT = contrastive particle; PV = preverbal particle, SUBJ = subjunctive, COND = conditional. Nominative case on nouns and person/number morphemes on verbs are only glossed when relevant. Definiteness agreement on the verb (which obtains with its object) is not glossed anywhere. Small capitalization indicates preverbal (contrastive) focus.

[2] From the internet journal *Gondola,* 30 June 2006, http://www.gondola.hu/index.php?rovat_id=10.

[3] Due to the requirement that old information topics precede new information ones, in this particular context the first occurrence of *az idén* 'this year' in (14) can only receive old information reading, while the last one only a new information one. In the middle position the adverb can provide either new or old information.

[4] This property is subject to variation across languages. Italian equivalent of (15a) is grammatical, while (15b) is ungrammatical, just like in Hungarian.

[5] Existential NP-islands contain a relative clause that modifies a non-specific NP in an existential sentence.

[6] In a framework where adverbials occupy specifiers of dedicated adverbial functional projections (Cinque 1999) the above way of reasoning would be different. In that framework, one could try to account for the observed word orders by assuming that topics adjoin to adverbial phrases containing sentential adverbials or predicate adverbial phrases. The reason why I do not adopt such an account has to do with the fact that the position of predicate adverbials in Hungairan is quite unlike the functional projections established in Cinque's hierarchy. It is clearly a left peripheral position, and it hosts a Hungarian-specific class of adverbs (referred to as *inclusive adverbs* in Kiefer 1967) that comprises members of various adverbial types in Cinque's classification: e.g. manner adverbs such as *óvatosan* 'carefully', frequentatives like *gyakran* 'often', completives like *teljesen* 'fully' and celeratives like *gyorsan* 'quickly'. Due to the mixed nature of predicate adverbs, it would be difficult to give a unique description to the semantic content of the adverbial functional head that would be associated with this class in Cinque's theory.

[7] Some speakers can also have the personal pronoun *ő* 'he/she' as a double when the left dislocated element is human:

(i) /*Péternek* (neki) EGY KÖNYVET adott Anna.
Péter-DAT 3SG-DAT a book-ACC gave Anna
'As for Péter, Anna gave him a BOOK (while to others, something else might apply).'

[8] Agreement in proximity is also necessary if the topic phrase is itself a proximate demonstrative phrase:

(i) /*Ennek a fiúnak* ennek /*annak EGY KÖNYVET adott Anna.
this- DAT the boy-DAT this-DAT / that-DAT a book-ACC gave Anna
'As for this boy, Anna gave him a BOOK (while to others, something else might apply).'

[9] É. Kiss (2002) explains the possibility of non-referential elements in left dislocated position as a result of

the implied contrast that is present on these. This contrast brings about an 'individualization' process, in which generic terms like *bicikli* 'bike' in (33a) get individuated and thus will act like a referential entity.

[10] It needs to be mentioned that sentences with multiple left dislocates need proper contextualization. They sound natural as answer to a question, but would be quite strange as an out-of-the-blue utterance. Notice also that multiple left dislocation usually occurs without overt resumptives (cf. 37b). When both resumptives are spelled out, they need to be adjacent to their respective topics. The order in which the resumptive elements follow all dislocates is ungrammatical:

(i) */*Anna* /*hétfőn* az akkor PÉTERREL találkozott.
Anna Monday-ON that then Péter-WITH met
'As for Anna, as for Monday, she met PÉTER (while to others on other days, something else might apply).'

[11] I do not consider the fourth logical possibility here, namely the scenario where both LD and *az* move to the left periphery, independently of each other. The problem with such a derivation is lack of motivation for the movement of *az*. Assuming that movement to the left is motivated by the (topical) discourse property of the moving constituent (whichever way we envisage this concerning the technical details), it is hard to see what would motivate movement of *az* on its own, since this phrase does not have any discourse function independently of the LD.

[12] This analysis might not be directly extendable to non-DP-type dislocation constructions, like (34a,b,c) above. As Lipták and Vicente (to appear) show, VP-left dislocation for one follows a different strategy in Hungarian and does not involve formation of a complex phrase.

[13] Note that Alberti and Medve (2000) also take left dislocated phrases to arrive to the left periphery via movement, but they do not provide specific evidence (other than observations from scope) for this claim.

[14] Both Kenesei, Vago and Fenyvesi (1998), and Gyuris (2002) provide examples in which a topic has a contrastive meaning but is pronounced without the special intonation of left dislocation.

[15] As the reader can recall, it is not only the meaning of these elements that differ, but several properties that are the results of this meaning difference: categorial restrictions, referentiality, obligatory association with emphatic operators — all due to the lack vs. presence of contrast.

[16] The contrastive nature of contrastive topics have lead Kenesei (1989) (as well as van Hoof (2000) and Kadmon (2001)) to assume that contrastive topics are a kind of focus constituents (*contrafocus* in Kenesei's terminology).

[17] Note that the contrastive particle follows the resumptive element in this example. The other way around, the sentence is much worse — in fact only possible if inserting a pause between particle and resumptive:

(i) Anna *regényt* (azt) olvas, /*novellát* viszont *(#) (azt) nem.
Anna novel-ACC that-ACC reads short.story-ACC C-PRT that-ACC not
'Novels, Anna reads those, short stories, on the other hand, she does not reads those.'

The fact that left dislocate and resumptive need to be adjacent in these examples dovetails neatly with the analysis provided for the resumptive element in section 3.1.2 above, in terms of a complex phrase in which the resumptive is in apposition to the left dislocate.

[18] Admittedly, this meaning difference is slight in the case of *azonban* and *viszont*, which is why *pedig* is chosen to illustrate this claim. In this respect the argument put through for the distinct status of these elements as clausal coordinators vs. contrastive particles works better for *pedig* and *meg*, the latter of which does not occur as a coordinator, as (70c) showed.

Pedig and *meg* are clearly different from *azonban* and *viszont* in other properties as well (recall also the difference in their sensitivity with certain verum focus constructions in (52)). For ease of exposition, however, I generalize over these differences and for the purposes of the present article treat all these elements alike. In future work I hope to return to the differences in more detail.

[19] It has to be noted that not all coordinators behave like heads, see for instance Den Dikken (2006) on phrasal coordinators in English.

[20] Grammaticalization can also be held responsible for the fact that the contrastive coordinator *azonban* 'that-IN', obviously a phrasal item originally, is now used as an X^0 head.

[21] I take ingredients of meaning such a contrast to be part of the content of functional projections. See Molnár (2002) for another view.