1. Welsh VSO clauses

In Welsh VSO clauses, the finite verb agrees in number with pronominal subjects, null or overt, but not with full nominal subjects. The (null) subject relative pronoun behaves like full nominals, not like (null or overt) non-relative pronouns, in exhibiting so-called anti-agreement. This is illustrated in (1)–(3) (from Rouveret 1991, 1994):

(1) a. *darllen-asant y plant y llyfr
    read-PST-3PL the children the book
b. darllen-odd y plant y llyfr
    read-PST-3SG the children the book
    ‘the children read the book’

(2) a. darllen-asant pro y llyfr
    read-PST-3PL pro the book
b. darllen-asant ᵛ y llyfr
    read-PST-3PL they the book
    ‘they read the book’

(3) a. *y plant Op a ddarllen-asant y llyfr
    the children REL read-PST-3PL the book
b. y plant Op a ddarllen-odd y llyfr
    the children REL read-PST-3SG the book
    ‘the children who/that read the book’

Rouveret (1991, 1994) proposes an interesting analysis of these (anti-)agreement phenomena. I will outline it here, adapting it in ways that do not affect the essence of the original account. Following Koopman and Sportiche (1991) and others, Rouveret assumes that the subject in VSO clauses is in a position lower than SpecAgrSP (e.g. SpecTP). From this it follows immediately that there can be no agreement relationship established between the subject and a number agreement feature in AgrS via Spec–Head agreement. This is sufficient to accommodate the lack of number agreement between the finite verb and the post-
verbal full nominal subject in (1b) (also cf. the structure in (5a), below). The singular number marking found in the ‘anti-agreement’ example in (1b) is an instance of default agreement.

For the Welsh VSO clauses with (null or overt) pronominal subjects in (2) Rouveret (1991, 1994) argues that, even though the pronoun itself does not move into the checking domain of AgrS, an agreement relationship is established in the examples in (2) via head movement of the head of the NumP (cf. Ritter 1991) dominating the pronoun, into an adjunction position to AgrS. The account of pronominal agreement is summarised in (4):

(4) a. pronominal subject = NumP
b. Num raises to AgrS
c. as a result of (4b), a checking relationship is established between AgrS and the subject in the lower specifier
d. hence there must be number agreement for pronominal subjects, null or overt (2)

The difference between full nominal phrases and the structure of pronouns lies in their size — while full nominals are DPs (including a NumP), pronouns are dominated by just a NumP. This minimal difference has important repercussions for the licensing of the Num–head. While Num in DP is licensed by raising to D, the head of a pronominal NumP cannot be so licensed; instead, Num raises to AgrS to establish a relationship with the Agr–head. Num–to–Agr movement, as depicted in (5b), is hence compulsory in the case of pronominal subjects in VSO clauses. Since Num–to–Agr movement results in a checking relationship between AgrS and Num, the obligatoriness of number agreement with pronominal postverbal subjects (2) follows. Number agreement with full nominal postverbal subjects is impossible, on the other hand, since (i) the full nominal DP does not raise to SpecAgrSP (no Spec–Head agreement), and (ii) Num raises only to D, not to AgrS: raising to D is sufficient to license Num, and besides, onward Num-movement from D to AgrS would arguably result in ‘improper movement’ (Li 1990) given that plausibly Num and AgrS are both A–type heads while D is an A’–type head.

(5) a. \[_{AgrSP} AgrS \ [_{TP} \ DP \ [_{T'} \ T \ ...]]] \rightarrow \text{anti-agreement}
   b. \[_{AgrSP} AgrS+Num_{i} \ [_{TP} \ [_{NumP} \ t_{i} \ [_{NP} \ pro/pronoun]] \ [_{T'} \ T \ ...]]] \] \rightarrow \text{agreement}
   c. \[_{CP} \ [_{NumP} Op_{i} \ [_{C'} \ C \ [_{AgrSP} AgrS \ [_{TP} \ t_{i} \ [_{T'} \ ...]]]]] \] \rightarrow \text{anti-agreement}

Number agreement between the null relative operator Op and the finite verb in (3) is impossible as well. The structure in (5c) makes it clear why this should
be the case. *Op*, in virtue of its being an operator, must raise to Spec,CP, an operator position. It moves there in one fell swoop — AgrS arguably does not project a specifier at all in Welsh VSO clauses, hence there is no position that *Op* could touch down in on its way up. By raising straight into Spec,CP, the operator makes it impossible for its Num–head to adjoin to AgrS, for Num–to–AgrS in (5c) would result in a proper binding violation: if Num did so raise, the complex AgrS–head containing it would never be high enough to enable raised Num to c-command/properly govern its trace. Since Num–to–AgrS is impossible in (5c), and since no Spec–Head relationship between AgrS and NumP obtains in this structure either, no number agreement between the relative operator and the finite verb of the relative clause can be established, and default singular marking is found, as seen in (3).  

2. Hungarian possessive DPs

2.1 *Hungarian nominative possessors and (anti-)agreement — Data*

This analysis of the Welsh (anti-)agreement facts in (1)–(3) finds strong confirmation in the distribution of number agreement in Hungarian possessed nominal phrases. Compare the examples in (6)–(8), involving subject–verb agreement in finite clauses, with those in (9)–(11), featuring (anti-)agreement between a nominative possessor and a possessed noun within DP.

(6) a. a nő mond-ja ...  
   the woman say-3SG  
   'the woman says ...'

   b. a nők mond-ják ...
   the women say-3PL  
   'the women say ...'

(7) a. (ő) mond-ja ...
   he/she/pro say-3SG  
   '(s)he says ...'

   b. (ők) mond-ják ...
   they/pro say-3PL  
   'they say ...'

(8) a. ki mond-ja ...?
   who say-3SG  
   who say ...

   b. kik mond-ják ...?
   who-PL say-3PL  
   who-PL say ...

(9) a. a nő kalap-ja
   the woman hat-3SG  
   'the woman's hat'

   b. a nők kalap-ja
   the women hat-3SG  
   'the women's hat'

(10) a. a(z) (ő) kalap-ja
    the (he/she) hat-3SG  
    'his/her hat'

   b. a(z) (ők) kalap-juk
    the (he/she) hat-3PL  
    'their hat'

(11) a. ki kalap-ja?
    who hat-3SG  
    who hat ...

   b. kik kalap-ja?
    who-PL hat-3SG  
    who-PL hat ...
Hungarian is a rich agreement language. In finite clauses, it features full number agreement between the subject and the finite verb — that is, the finite verb always agrees in number with its subject, regardless of whether it is a full noun phrase (6), a (null or overt) pronominal subject (7) or a pronominal operator (8). Hungarian also shows an agreement relationship between the head of a possessed noun phrase and its nominative possessor, reflected in a set of agreement morphemes which is highly similar (though not quite identical\(^3\)) to the set found on finite verbs (cf. Szabolcsi 1992); cf. (9)–(11). Interestingly, though, number agreement, while total in finite clauses, is only partial in the nominal domain — as a comparison of the possessive nominal examples in (9)–(11) with the clauses in (6)–(8) shows, full nominal nominative possessors as well as the wh-pronoun \(kí(k)\) exhibit anti-agreement in number with the possessive marker; pronominal subjects, by contrast, do show systematic number marking in the possessive affix.\(^4\)

The asymmetry seen in (9)–(11) between full nominals and operators on the one hand, and pronominals on the other recalls the Welsh facts in Section 1, above, something which Szabolcsi (1992:39) also notes in passing.\(^5\) Hungarian adds what looks like a surprising quirk to the paradigm, though: the nominative possessive pronoun \(í\) (unlike the nominative subject pronoun \(ó\) seen in (7)) cannot bear the plural morpheme \(-k\), hence is invariably realised as \(ô\) even when the possessor is a plural; to mark plurality of the pronominal possessor, the plural possessive agreement marker is used, as seen in (10b).\(^6\) Number agreement in possessive nominals with nominative possessors thus differs from number agreement in finite clauses in two respects: (i) full nominal and wh-pronominal possessors show anti-agreement in featuring a default singular agreement marker on the possessed noun with plural possessors; and (ii) the overt pronominal possessor \(ô\) shows anti-agreement in the other direction, as it were, in being itself unmarked for number while triggering a plural marker on the possessed noun in the plural.

2.2 **Hungarian nominative possessors and (anti-)agreement — Analysis**

To be able to make sense of these facts, I will start out from the general hypotheses in (12), below. Following my earlier work, I assume that dative/possessor shift is a Predicate Inversion process targeting a functional projection FP outside the dative small clause. In the extended projection of possessed nouns, this FP finds itself below AgrP, which in its turn is dominated by DP. The structure of possessed nominals involving possessor shift that I will avail myself of thus reads as in (13), the b–structure representing the output of the
Predicate Inversion operation that manoeuvres the (empty-headed) dative PP into a position preceding the possessed noun.\(^7\)

\[(12)\]

a. what underlies all possessive constructions is a structure in which the possessum is the subject of a dative small clause whose head (the dative preposition) takes the possessor as its complement:
\[ [SC \mbox{POSSESSUM} [PP_{dat} \mbox{POSSESSOR}]] \mbox{cf. Den Dikken 1995, to appear} \]
b. the dative predicate can undergo dative shift, i.e. movement of the beheaded dative PP to an A-specifier position just outside the small clause (cf. Den Dikken 1995, to appear)
c. the internal functional structure of nominal phrases mirrors that of clauses to a significant extent; DPs include an AgrP

d. the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) holds strictly of Agr(S)P in clauses; i.e. the Agr head inside DP has no EPP–feature, hence no Spec (cf. Chomsky 1981, 1995 on EPP)

\[(13)\]

a. \[ [DP \mbox{D A}_{GrP} \mbox{Agr} [FP \mbox{Spec} \mbox{F} [SC \mbox{POSSESSUM} [PP_{dat} \mbox{POSSESSOR}]]]] \]
b. \[ [DP \mbox{D A}_{GrP} \mbox{Agr} [FP [PP_{t_k} \mbox{POSSESSOR}]] [F_{F} + P_{k} [SC \mbox{POSSESSUM} t_{i}]]] \]

This said, we can now carry over Rouveret’s (1991, 1994) account of the number agreement facts in Welsh VSO clauses into the domain of possessive nominals. Recall that, as shown in (5), repeated below, an agreement relationship between AgrS and the postverbal pronominal subject is established via Num–to–AgrS movement (cf. (5b)), while in the case of full DP and pronominal operator subjects no such relationship can be attained. The structures in (14) now reveal the full parallelism between Welsh VSO clauses and the examples of Hungarian nominative possessor constructions in section 2.1.

\[(5)\]

a. \[ [A_{GrS} \mbox{AgrS} [TP \mbox{DP} \mbox{T} \mbox{...}]] \]
\[ \rightarrow \mbox{anti-agreement} \]
b. \[ [A_{GrS} \mbox{AgrS} + \mbox{NumP} \mbox{[TP} \mbox{[NumP} \mbox{t_i [NP \mbox{pro/pronoun}] [T_{T} \mbox{...}]]]} \]
\[ \rightarrow \mbox{agreement} \]
c. \[ [C_{CP} \mbox{NumP} \mbox{Opi} \mbox{[C_{A_{GrS} \mbox{AgrS} [TP} \mbox{t_i [T_{T} \mbox{...}]]}]} \]
\[ \rightarrow \mbox{anti-agreement} \]

\[(14)\]

a. \[ [DP \mbox{D A}_{GrP} \mbox{Agr} [FP [PP_{t_k} \mbox{nO} \mbox{(k)}] \mbox{F} \mbox{... kalap} \mbox{...}]]] \]
\[ (= \mbox{(13b)}) \]
b. \[ [DP \mbox{D A}_{GrP} \mbox{Agr} + \mbox{NumP} \mbox{[FP} \mbox{[PP_{t_k} \mbox{NumP} \mbox{t_n [NP \mbox{proO}]]} \mbox{F} \mbox{... kalap} \mbox{...}]]] \]

c. \[ [DP \mbox{NumP} \mbox{kO} \mbox{(k)}] \mbox{[D_{A_{GrP} \mbox{Agr} [FP} \mbox{t_i [F_{F} \mbox{... kalap} \mbox{...}]]}] \]

Just like (5a) and (5c) yield anti-agreement, so do (14a,c), the representations for full nominal/wh-pronominal possessors emanating from (12)–(13); the possessor
is either in SpecFP, below Agr (as in (14a)), or it raises straight into Spec,DP (as in (14c)); in neither case can there be Num–to–Agr movement or a Spec–Head configuration between Agr and the possessor at any point in the derivation. And just like (5b) yields agreement, so does (14b), the structure of (null/overt) pronominal possessors: Num–to–Agr movement establishes a link between the possessor and the DP–internal Agr–head.

What makes the case of Hungarian nominative possessor agreement so interesting is that Rouveret’s hypothesis that number agreement with pronominal post–Agr subjects is the result of Num–to–Agr raising is overtly confirmed by the behaviour of Hungarian overt pronominal possessors. Consider again the example in (10b), repeated in a slightly modified form as (15):

(15) az \( \delta \) kalap-juk (*\( \delta k \) ... -ja/juk)
    the (s)he hat-3PL
    ‘their hat’

The Hungarian overt nominative pronominal possessor \( \delta \) is not marked for number; instead, it is the possessive affix on the possessed noun that expresses the possessor’s number. This quirk of the third person pronoun in the domain of nominative possessor constructions has led traditional grammarians (e.g. János Lotz; see Szabolcsi 1992) to believe that \( \delta \) in (15) is a possessive adjective (similar to Italian suo in *il suo padre ‘his father’) — the lack of number marking on third person pronominal possessors would then match the lack of number marking on Hungarian attributive adjectives in general.

The idea that \( \delta \) is a possessive adjective is unlikely to carry the day, however. For one thing, the formal identity of the nominative pronoun \( \delta \) seen in (7a) and the putatively adjectival possessor \( \delta \) in (15) indicates that such a move would unduly inflate the Hungarian lexicon. Moreover, an approach to (15) along these lines would not naturally extend into the realm of adpositional phrases, which feature exactly the same behaviour of the emphatic pronoun \( \delta \): it is invariant, number being marked in the inflection suffixed to P:

(16) a. \( \delta \) nek-i/ról-a/vel-e/...
    (s)he to/about/with/...+SG.AGR
    b. \( \delta \) nek-ik/ról-uk/vel-ük/... (*\( \delta k \) vel-e/ük etc.)
    (s)he to/about/with/...+PL.AGR

An analysis of (16b) in terms of ‘possessive adjectives’ would be most implausible in view of the fact that P–projections do not normally accept adjectival modifiers.

The Num–to–Agr approach to agreement with post–Agr pronouns emanating from Rouveret’s work, by contrast, brings forth a natural account for the facts in
(15) and (16b). Let us start off with the possessive noun phrase in (15), analysed as in (14b). The crucial step in the analysis is the adjunction of the Num–head of the pronominal phrase to Agr, which I will argue entails the physical displacement of the number morpheme -k in Hungarian. As a starting point for the analysis, consider the differences between Hungarian and Welsh/English with respect to number marking, illustrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hungarian</th>
<th>Welsh</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRONOUN — SG</td>
<td>δ</td>
<td>ef</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRONOUN — PL</td>
<td>δk</td>
<td>hwy</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM SUFFIX — SG</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-dd</td>
<td>-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUM SUFFIX — PL</td>
<td>-k</td>
<td>-ant</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Welsh is similar to English with respect to number in the pronominal system, featuring different stems for ‘(s)he’ and ‘they’, Hungarian marks plurality on nouns, pronouns and third person agreement suffixes in an entirely concatenative fashion, adding a -k (plus a vowel when syllabification constraints so require) throughout.

Recognising the concatenative nature of Hungarian plural marking, I propose to place the plural morpheme -k in the Num–head of the noun’s extended projection. Within DP, the plural marker always amalgamates with the head noun, via Affix Hopping.\(^8\) It does so with pronouns in most contexts as well, with one systematic exception — whenever the pronoun is the nominative possessor of a possessed noun phrase, Num–to–Agr movement severs the pronoun from the number morpheme -k, which affixes to the Agr–head and creates the formative -juk seen in the example in (10b). This is illustrated in (17); -juk, the result of Num–to–Agr, amalgamates with the possessed noun via Affix Hopping (not overt-syntactic N–to–Agr movement; cf. n. 8).\(^9\)

\[(17) \quad \text{DP} \ D \ [\text{AgrP} \ -ju-+\text{[Num -k]}_n \ [\text{PP} \ t_k \ [\text{NumP} \ t_n \ [\text{NP} \ \emptyset]]]_i \ [f' \ \ldots \ \text{kalap} \ \ldots]]] \]

\[(18) \quad \text{[PP} \ [\text{NumP} \ t_n \ [\text{NP} \ \emptyset]]_i \ [f' \ P+\text{[Num -k]}_n \ t_i]] \]

The case of (16b), depicted in (18), is essentially similar, on the assumption that the Hungarian postpositions are prepositional underlyingly (cf. Kayne 1994 for generalised head–complement order, and Zwart 1994, Helmantel 1997 for analyses of Dutch/German postPPs built on a head-initial structure). P takes a NumP complement whenever it selects a pronominal object; the Num–head
incorporates into $P$ and the remnant $\text{NumP}$ is moved into a specifier position to the left of the $P$-head ($\text{SpecPP}$ in (18), for simplicity).

Hungarian thus allows us to diagnose $\text{Num}$–to–$\text{Agr}$ movement because of the concatenativity of its plural marking system. The physical displacement of the number marker $-k$ in the examples in (15) and (16b), severing the pronominal head from associate $\text{Num}$, yields direct empirical support for Rouveret’s (1991, 1994) analysis of agreement with pronominal subjects in VSO type structures. The facts of number marking in Hungarian DPs with nominative possessors at the same time vindicate the $\text{Num}$–to–$\text{Agr}$ approach and corroborate an analysis of the structure of possessed nominal phrases which assimilates them to VSO clauses of the type found in Welsh.

3. English possessive DPs

We can do even better than this — we can also underpin the Predicate Inversion approach to prenominal possessive constructions on the basis of agreement facts. For this purpose, we need to widen our scope to include number (anti-)agreement in English ‘Saxon genitival’ constructions, to be contrasted with number agreement in English finite copular sentences.

I start out from the observation that the contracted/reduced third singular form of the English copula has precisely the same allomorphs as ‘Saxon’ genitival ‘s, as seen in (19):

$$
\begin{align*}
(19) & \quad \text{(a)} \quad \text{Jack’s ill} & [s] & \quad \text{Jack’s illness} & [s] \\
& \quad \text{(b)} \quad \text{Jill’s ill} & [z] & \quad \text{Jill’s illness} & [z] \\
& \quad \text{(c)} \quad \text{Bess’s ill} & [iz] & \quad \text{Bess’s illness} & [iz]
\end{align*}
$$

This renders an assimilation of the two formatives plausible.\(^{10}\) What would seem to fly in the face of such an assimilation is the intriguing asymmetry between the two concerning agreement. English shows systematic number agreement between the subject and the finite copula in copular sentences, irrespective of whether the subject is a full DP, a pronominal or an operator, as seen in (20)–(22). But agreement is only partial possessed nominals (cf. (23)–(25)) — while the third person pronouns $he$ and $they$ do indeed agree with the genitival marker (with $they$ triggering the expected form ‘$re$ in (24b) just as in (21b)), full nominal and $wh$-pronominal possessors invariably combine with ‘$s regardless of their number.\(^{11}\)
The asymmetry between full nominals and operator pronouns on the one hand, and non-wh pronouns on the other, seen in (23)-(25), recalls the Welsh VSO facts in Section 1 and fully matches Hungarian (9)-(11). Exploiting this parallelism, I claim that ‘Saxon’ genitival *s is a copular element serving basically the same purpose that copular elements do in general, in their guise as support morphemes. In Den Dikken (1995b, to appear) I have argued in detail that copular elements are phonetic realisations of certain functional heads. Tense (T) is one of those heads; and I have argued in the works mentioned that the head F in (13) (repeated below), the structure of prenominal possessor constructions, is another.

(13) a. \[DP \{ AgrP Agr \{ FP Spec \{ F [SC POSSUM [PP P_dat POSSESSOR]]}\]\]  
   b. \[DP \{ AgrP Agr \{ FP \{ PP t_k POSSUM\} [F F+P_k [SC POSSUM t_i]]}\]\]

While, as we have seen in section 2, Hungarian does not spell out F in possessive nominal constructions (for reasons discussed in Den Dikken and Lipták 1997 and Den Dikken to appear), English overtly signals the presence of the complex F-node in (13b) by realising it in the form of the ‘genitival marker’, now to be viewed as an incarnation of the copula (cf. (26)).

Once we assume that the ‘genitival marker’ is a copular element on a par with the copula seen in the sentences in (20)–(22), the facts in (23)–(25) can immediately be identified as (anti-)agreement effects on a par with those found in Hungarian possessive nominals with nominative possessors, which in turn are of a piece with the Welsh data that opened this paper. In addition to showing that the Hungarian (anti-)agreement pattern in possessive DPs does not stand on its own, the English facts also confirm an important ingredient of my analysis of possessive constructions and possessor/dative shift — the idea that possessors end up to the left of the noun phrases that they possess as a result of a syntactic movement operation of the Predicate Inversion type.

For the account of the facts in (23)–(25) to go through, we have to find a raison d'être for the emergence in the structure of ‘Saxon’ genitival constructions of the ‘genitival marker’, the copular element. We know independently that
English and other languages use copular elements very sparsely. Thus, in (27a) 
_to be_ can be freely left out, and in the DP in (28a) nothing separates subject and 
predicate either. But in the b–examples, the copulas _be_ and _of_ (on the latter, see 
Den Dikken 1995b, to appear) are indispensable.

(27)  a. I consider John (to be) the best candidate
     b. I consider the best candidate *(to be) John

(28)  a. Dennis the menace
     b. that menace *(of) a boy

There always has to be something to force the realisation of a copular element; 
in the absence of a trigger for the presence of FP in the structure, structural 
economy will leave it out. The reason in question, in the case of prenominal 
possessor constructions, is Predicate Inversion: the word order of constructions 
of the type seen in Hungarian (9)–(11) and English (23)–(25) results from 
inversion of the (beheaded) dative PP harbouring the possessor around its subject, 
the possessum; Predicate Inversion is contingent on the presence of FP (cf. Den 
Dikken 1995b, to appear); and in English we can actually see the presence of FP 
in the obligatory emergence of a copular element (the ‘Saxon genitival marker’) 
in the prenominal possessor construction.

4. Clauses versus nominal phrases

Welsh VSO clauses pattern with English ‘Saxon genitival’ constructions and 
Hungarian possessed noun phrases with nominative possessors in showing system­
atic anti-agreement. But finite clauses in Hungarian and English alike show 
obligatory, total agreement between the subject and the finite verb, regardless of 
the nature (full DP, pronoun, operator) of the subject (cf. (6)–(8) and (20)–(22)).

To make the discussion of (anti-)agreement complete, therefore, I should add a word 
about the contrast between clauses and nominal phrases in English and Hungarian.

To accommodate the behaviour of finite clauses with respect to (anti-)agreement, I can be brief, though. All we need to do is take another look at (12d), 
which says that the tokens of Agr found in clauses and nominal phrases (may) 
differ with respect to their possession of an EPP–feature. On the entirely standard 
assumption that English and Hungarian AgrS has an EPP–feature (while the 
Agr–head inside DP in these languages, as presumably in all other languages, 
does not), all subjects, pronominal and full nominal alike, must raise to 
SpecAgrSP to check this feature. As a result, number agreement with the finite 
verb is systematically established via Spec–Head agreement.
Welsh VSO sentences are different from English and Hungarian finite clauses — their subject is not in SpecAgrSP (either because Welsh AgrS has no EPP-feature or because the EPP in Welsh is checked in some other way; cf. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, to appear), hence establishing a number agreement relationship in a Spec–Head configuration is impossible.

5. Concluding remarks

In this paper I have presented an account of (anti-)agreement effects in possessive nominal constructions in English and Hungarian, building on Rouveret’s (1991, 1994) account of (anti-)agreement in Welsh VSO sentences. I have shown that Rouveret’s Num-to–Agr raising mechanism to account for number agreement with post–Agr pronominal subjects is corroborated in a directly observable way by Hungarian DP–internal nominative possessors. An extension of the analysis into the domain of English ‘Saxon genitival’ constructions further underpinned a Predicate Inversion approach to prenominal possessors, and substantiated an assimilation of the ‘genitival marker’ ’s and the contracted form of the finite 3SG copula ‘s. The treatment of English genitival ’s as a copular element in turn leads to the conclusion that the Saxon genitival marker sits in a position substantially lower in the structure than D (a position identified here as the functional head F). Finally, the analysis of (anti-)agreement effects in the nominal phrase presented here vindicates the postulation of a category Agr inside DP, thereby once again confirming the parallelism between the structure of clauses and that of nominal phrases.

Notes

1. Here and elsewhere I will consider only third person subjects, essentially for two reasons: (i) third person pronouns, in contradistinction to first or second person pronouns, allow for a direct comparison with full nominal phrases; and (ii) the (anti-)agreement phenomena which are the topic of the present investigation involve number marking, which is relevant for full nominal phrases and third person pronouns but not in any obvious sense for first or second person pronouns (we is not the plural of I).

2. The Num–head of Op in (5c) arguably gets licensed via Spec–Head agreement with C, whose projection is linked to the head of the relative clause via predication. Though the analysis of the relative clauses in (3) is phrased in the pre-Kaynean standard null operator analysis, Kayne’s (1994) head raising account of relative clause constructions also accommodates the anti-agreement facts in (3). I have elected to use the standard null
operator movement analysis since it allows a straightforward generalisation over relative clauses and *wh*-movement constructions; see below.

3. I will gloss over the differences between agreement morphology in finite clauses and possessive noun phrases here, following Szabolcsi (1992) in this respect.

4. The paradigm in (9)–(11) can be reproduced in its entirety for plural possessums (*the woman's hats* etc.), with *-jai* replacing *-ja* and *-jaik* replacing *-juk*; cf. also fn. 9, below.

   While it is true that variants of (11) with *dative*-marked *wh*-possessors are preferred, in present-day Hungarian, to the nominative forms in (11) (of which (11a) is starred in Szabolcsi 1992:40), the DPs in (11) represent a grammatical (though archaic) pattern also seen in idioms like *ki a borja?* ‘who on earth (lit. whose son whose lamb)’. (Space limitations prevent me from discussing Hungarian possessive constructions with dative-marked possessors in this paper.)

5. She writes: ‘kollégák tájékoztatása szerint ugyanez a helyzet a velsziben’ (*according to colleagues, the same is the case in Welsh*) — an interesting quote because of the real-life example of (8b), *kollégák tájékoztatása* ‘colleague-3PL information-3SG’.

6. Note that what is said here with respect to overt pronominal nominative possessors holds only of *ő*, not of other third person pronouns, which behave like full nominals when it comes to agreement marking in possessive DPs; the pronouns in question are the third person polite forms *őn/(ők)* ‘You’ and *maga/maguk* ‘You’, and the old-fashioned/rural form *kend/(ek)*.

7. I am glossing over a number of details of the analysis which are immaterial for the discussion at hand; see Den Dikken (to appear) for full discussion, against the background of the minimalist locality theory (Chomsky 1995).

8. In view of the fact that attributive adjectives and possessors precede rather than follow the head noun, it seems unlikely that *N* undergoes overt head-movement to *Agr*. A lexicalist/minimalist approach in which morphemes are denied independent status as terminals of syntactic phrase-markers substantially complicates the analysis of (10b)/(15). Number would then be represented as a feature on both *Num* and the (pro)nominal head; it is unclear why movement of *Num* to *Agr* should make it impossible for the (surely [+interpretable]) number feature of the pronoun to receive a phonetic realisation on the pronoun itself (in the form of *-k*).

9. The idea that the plural marker *-k* of the pronominal possessor raises, independently of the pronoun in its complement, to *Agr* and amalgamates with the possessive marker there is perhaps supported even more clearly by the facts of Hungarian possessed nominals with a plural possessum (see fn. 4, above). Hungarian marks plurality of the possessum by adding an *-i* to the possessive marker — so the plural of *kalapja* is *kalapjai*. Interestingly, a plural possessum with a plural pronominal possessor (such as English *their hats*) features a possessive marker in *-i* (marking plurality of the possessor) followed by a *-k*, which on the present analysis is the reflex of *Num*-to-*Agr* raising — cf. *az Ő kalapjai* ‘his/her hats’ and *az Ő kalapjait* ‘their hats’; *-k* (raised *Num*) docks on at the right edge of the possessive marker.

10. Modern English has two other formatives with precisely the same set of allomorphs: the 3*sg* agreement marker of present-tense verbs, and the regular plural marker on nouns. The link between 3*sg* *-s* and the contracted form of the copula *‘s* is obvious (both are 3*sg*
(ANTI-)AGREEMENT IN DP

inflections). The plural marker -s, though identical with copular 's and genitival 's in its allophones, is in fact distinct in its behaviour with respect to voice alternations — while plural -s triggers voicing of /f/ in wife/wives, the two instantiations of 's do not (cf. my wife's ill and my wife's illness); cf. Jespersen (1965:vol. VI, p. 264) for related discussion.

11. Though the German 3SG possessive pronoun sein is phonologically identical with the infinitival copula (as in sein oder nicht sein 'to be or not to be'), this is not an agreeing form; it does not figure in (anti-)agreement paradigms, therefore. Dutch zijn is more tricky; alongside its guise as a possessive pronoun, it shows up not just as the infinitival form of the copula (as in zijn of niet zijn 'to be or not to be') but also as its present-tense plural form (as in wij/jullie/zij zijn ziek 'we/you(PL)/they are ill'). Identifying possessive zijn and finite-copular zijn is dubious, however, in the light of the fact that zijn qua possessive pronoun has a reduced form z'n (with a schwa) while copular zijn (infinitive or 3PL present tense) does not.
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