Gábor Alberti (Univ. Pécs) & Judit Farkas (RIL HAS):[1]   alberti.gabor@pte.hu, juttasusi@gmail.com

Arguments for Arguments in the Complement of the Hungarian Nominal Head

http://lingua.btk.pte.hu/gelexi.asp?path=&file=Story3%7E1%7E1%7E1NComplementation120831%2Epdf

This talk argues that a Hungarian nominal head may have a (phonetically not empty) complement zone containing arguments of this head, including the possessor (a distinguished argument in Hungarian seeing that it shows agreement in person and number with the head (Lehmann 1988)).

1. Approaches to N-complement

1.1 The Argument (Inheritance) Principle

Let our starting point be Broekhuis et al.'s (2012: page x) standpoint concerning the Dutch DP, formulated in (1a) below (*SoD*): "Although this is often less conspicuous with nouns, adjectives and prepositions, it is possible to describe examples like (1b) ... [as follows]. The phrases between straight brackets can be seen as predicates that are predicated of the noun phrase *Jan*, which we may therefore call their logical SUBJECT (...). Furthermore, ... the noun *vriend* may combine with a PP-complement that explicates with whom the SUBJECT *Jan* is in a relation of friendship..." As (1c) shows, however, the "canonical" Hungarian generative literature (*Strukturális*...) accepts no postnominal complement domain.

(1) a. [$_{DP}$ ... D ... [$_{NP}$ ... N ...]]
  b. Jan is [een vriend *van Peter*]
    Jan is a   friend of   Peter
  c. [$_{DP}$ ... D [$_{NP}$ (DP) ... N]]]: the DP structure in Szabolcsi&Laczkó (1992:291, (6))

1.2 The complement of N in Hungarian: is there any at all?

I. No complement. → (1c) (Szabolcsi&Laczkó 1992). The reason lies in the practice of using the focus construction in Hungarian as a *Constituency Test* (*SoD*:1121) → (4).

II. Yes (in "deep str.") **& No** (in "surface str.")[2] É. Kiss (1998:86, (54)): [$_{DP}$ NP$_i$ D [$_{predNP}$ N+I $\varnothing_i$]
    NP$_i$: obligatorily moving "long" possessor → (2)

(2) • Constraint on Case assignment (É. Kiss 1998:77)
    a. The case marker of an NP appears on the right edge of this NP.
    b. The case marker cliticizes on the head of the NP (or, in the case of an empty head, it cliticizes on the constituent preceding the head).

III. Yes. Alberti&Medve (2002/2005:141–142, and Chapter 6): [$_{DP}$ ... D [$_{NP}$ ... [$_{N'}$ N ...]]]

(3) • Argument (Inheritance) Principle:
    a. Lexical-semantic (and conceptual (Laczkó 2000)) arguments of heads appear in X' (as sisters of X)
    b. They can remain *in situ* (under certain circumstances).

– tension between (3b)+(XP=NP) and (2) → (3b)+(XP=NP) is typically not preferred,20131009
– but its status depends on an intricate cooperation of many factors almost totally ignored in the literature
– certain constellations of these factors make (3b)+(XP=NP) acceptable / optimal
– whilst, typically, only "simpler" constellations are considered in the literature – editors hate long sentences... ;)
– a (3b)-type word order can often be accounted for by retaining (2) – with the aid of movement

---

[2] É. Kiss (1998:85–86): "A birtokos szerepű bővítményt a kiinduló szerkezetben a bővítmények szokásos helyén: az alaptag mögött, annak testvéreként vesszük fel. A [...] esetadás-megszorítás azonban az NP-ben nem engedélyez bővítményt az alaptag mögött; következésképp a birtokost topikszerűen, az NP élére kell vinnünk, és a főneves kifejezés egészét magában foglaló DP kategóriához kell csatolnunk."

1.3 The Focus Test

(4) ● The application of Focus Test to the Hungarian NP

    a. *[A kalapja$_N$ Péter] veszett el.   (Szabolcsi & Laczkó 1992:190, (10a-b))

       the hat.Poss.3Sg Péter lost   away

     intended meaning: 'It is Peter's hat that has been lost.'

    a'. *[A kalapja$_N$ Péternek]$_{Focus}$ veszett el.

       the hat.Poss.3Sg Peter.Dat   lost   away

     intended meaning: 'It is Peter's hat that has been lost.'

    b. <mark>*?</mark>Minket [a vita   Péterrel] fárasztott el   ennyire. (Bartos 2000:689-692)

       we.Acc   the debate Péter.Ins exhausted away so_much

     'It is the debate with Peter that has exhausted us so much.'

    b'. <mark>*</mark>Mi [a vitá**tól**   Péterrel] /[a vita   Péterreltől] vagyunk ennyire fáradtak.

       we   the debate.**Abl** Péter.Ins / the debate Péter.Ins.Abl be.1Pl   so_much tired.Pl

     'It is the debate with Peter that has made us so tired.'

– Approach I. uses the focus construction in Hungarian as a *constituency test* (SoD 2012:1121)

– but the focus construction is not suitable for this task:

    it refuses any sort of "right branching" from the head (5)

– NB. Bartos (2000) observes (mentions) that the phonetic weight of the case marker of the N head *counts*

    cf. (4b)~(4b')

(5) • The application of Focus Test to right branching phrases

Subordinate Clause in a DP: [... N CP]

a. Ki hívott meg? *[F Az a lány, akivel tegnap találkoztunk], hívott meg.
who invited Perf   that the girl   who.Ins yesterday met.1Pl   invited perf

a'. Ki hívott meg? [F Az a lány] hívott meg, akivel tegnap találkoztunk.
who invited perf   that the girl   invited perf who.Ins yesterday met.1Pl

'Who has invited you?' 'The one who has invited me is the girl we met yesterday.'

AdvP: [... Adv$_V$ DP]

b. Hogy találták meg Pétert? *[F Berúgva a bortól] találták meg.
how found.3Pl perf Péter.Acc drunk   the wine.Abl found.3Pl perf

b'. Hogy találták meg Pétert? [F A bortól berúgva] találták meg.
how found.3Pl perf Péter.Acc the wine.Abl drunk   found.3Pl perf

'How was Péter found? He was found drunk from the wine.'

InfP: [... Inf$_V$ DP]

c. Mi célból mentél át Boglárra? *[F Átúszni a Balatont] mentem át Boglárra.
what aim.Ela went.2Sg across Boglár.Sub   swim_across.Inf the Balaton.Acc went.1Sg across Boglár.Sub

c'. Mi célból mentél át Boglárra? [F A Balatont átúszni] mentem át Boglárra.
what aim.Ela went.2Sg across Boglár.Sub the Balaton.Acc swim_across.Inf went.1Sg across Boglár.Sub

'Why did you go over to Boglár? I went over to Boglár in order to swim across Lake Balaton'

1.4 When the "ill-formed" is quite well-formed (according to the literature)...

In spite of their Approach I., Szabolcsi & Laczkó (1992: 257-258) accept many examples which seem to support Approach III (6-8). Moreover, they began to investigate the factors of their acceptability.

– argument > adjunct

(6) • Arguments / adjuncts after the N head

    a. János megérkezése   Pestre / ?Máriával ma is   beszédtéma.
       János arrival.Poss.3Sg Pest.Sub / Mária.Ins today also topic
       'János's arrival in Pest / with Mária is still a hot topic.'

    b. A fiúk   találkozása   Máriával / ?Pesten ma   is   beszédtéma.
       the boy.Pl meeting.Poss.3Sg Mária.Ins / Pest.Sub today also topic
       'The boys' meeting with Mária / in Pest is still a hot topic.'

– lighter N-case (best: Nominative)   – weight of argument-case > weight of N-case

(7) • Comparison of the case marker of the N head with that of its argument

    a. Sokat   gondolkodtam [a biztonsági emberek összeesküvéséről   a   király ellen].
       a_lot.Acc thought.1Sg   the security   people   conspiracy.Poss.3Sg.Del the king   against
       'I have been thinking a lot about the conspiracy of the security staff against the king.'

    b. ?Sokat   gondolkodtam [Mária találkozásáról   Péterrel]
       a_lot.Acc thought.1Sg   Mária   meeting.Poss.3Sg.Del Péter.Ins
       'I have been thinking a lot about Mária's meeting with Péter.'

c. ??Sokan érdeklődtek   [Mária találkozása   ==felől== Péterrel].
   many   interested_in.Past.3Pl Mária   meeting.Poss.3Sg about Péter.Ins
   'Many were interested in Mária's meeting with Péter.'

d. ?Sokan érdeklődtek   [a biztonsági emberek összeesküvése   ==felől== a   király ==ellen==].
   many   interested_in.Past.3Pl the security   people   conspiracy.Poss.3Sg about the king   against
   'Many were interested in the conspiracy of the security staff against the king.'

– Szabolcsi & Laczkó (1992:264, (134)): =="too heavily burdened" pre-N zone== → (8f) is preferred

(8) • Preferred version with a constituent after the N head in Szabolcsi and Laczkó's (1992:265) chapter

a. *az este   hatkor való   Máriával való   találkozás
   the evening at_six be.PresPrt Mária.Ins be.PresPrt meeting

b. *a Máriával való   este   hatkor való   találkozás
   the Mária.Ins be.PresPrt evening at_six   be.PresPrt meeting

c. *a Máriával este   hatkor való   találkozás
   the Mária.Ins evening at_six   be.PresPrt meeting

d. ?az este   hatkor Máriával való   találkozás
   the evening at_six   Mária.Ins be.PresPrt meeting

e. ?a Máriával való   találkozás este   hatkor
   the Mária.Ins be.PresPrt meeting   evening at_six

f. az este   hatkor való   találkozás Máriával
   the evening at_six   be.PresPrt meeting   Mária.Ins
   'the meeting with Mária at 18.00'

2. Further potential tests concerning the constituent status of NPs with non-empty complements

2.1 Right Periphery

– problem: not necessarily one constituent – complements can be extracted to V' (Approach II):

[$_{VP}$ ... V ... DP ... [$_{DP}$ ... N $\varnothing_i$... $\varnothing_j$...] ... DP$_i$ ... DP$_j$ ...]

– É. Kiss' (1998) VP-contraction: The complement of the verb takes every constituent that (originally/semantically) belongs to the complement of any constituent in its complement. But...

(9) • "Behaghel Test" on the constituent status of noun phrases with non-empty N-complements (c.f. É. Kiss 2009)

    a. Elmondattad   végül   *Approach III + Behaghel → ✓sentence*

        [a két kis cserfes hódmezővásárhelyi unokahúgoddal]

        [a gyerekkorunkból ismert tréfás kis verset   Mórictól   a három dühös tehénről]?

        recite.Caus.Past.DefObj.2Sg   finally

        the two little talky   Hódmezővásárhely.Adj niece.Poss.2Sg.Ins

        the childhood.Poss.1Pl.Ela known funny little poem.Acc Móricz.Abl the three angry cow.Del

        'Did you finally make your two little talkative nieces from Hódmezővásárhely recite the funny little poem, known from our childhood, from Móricz about the three angry cows?'

        ✓sentence + Approach II → ~~Behaghel~~   *Approach II + Behaghel → *?sentence*

    b. Elmondattad végül   c. *?Elmondattad végül

        [a két kis cserfes hódmezővásárhelyi unokahúgoddal]   [Mórictól]

        [a gyerekkorunkból ismert tréfás kis verset]   [a három tehénről]

        [Mórictól]   [a gyerekkorunkból ismert tréfás kis verset]

        [a három dühös tehénről]?   [a két kis cserfes hódmezővásárhelyi unokahúgoddal]?

2.2. Noun phrases in short answers

(10) • Test concerning right branching NPs relying on short answers?

Melyik verset   mondod   el?
which   poem.Acc tell.DefObj.2Sg away

Azt   a   tréfás kis gyerekverset   ~~mondom   el~~ *Móricztól a különböző színű tehenekről.*
that.Acc the funny little nursery_rhyme.Acc ~~tell.DefObj.1Sg away~~ Móricz.Abl the different   colored cow.Pl.Del

'Which poem will you recite?
    ~~I will recite~~ that funny little nursery rhyme from Móricz about the differently colored cows.'

– problem: it is not easy to refuse that the structure of the short answer is the elliptical variant of that of the (mirror) focus construction of the corresponding complete answer (see also Lipták (2011):

$$[_{FP} [_{DP} ... N \varnothing_k \varnothing_m]_i\ \text{V}_t\text{+F}\ [_{v'} \varnothing_t ... \varnothing_i ...]\ ...\ DP_k\ DP_m\ ...]$$

2.3. Answers without Focus

→ Let us rely the Hungarian constituency test on *answers* (→potentially one constituent)
    that are *complete* sentences (→more explicit structure)
        but contain *no focus* (see 1.3)
            → non-exhaustive "For example,..." answers (contain contrastive topics)

3. Factors which might influence the judgment on noun phrases with non-empty complements

3.1 The weight of the case on the N head

Table 1: Dependence on the weight of the inflection on N (our test sentences available here: *lingua...@...*)

	I: [N POS **OBL**]	II: [N POS OBL]	III: [N OBL **POS**]	IV: [N OBL POS]
-	✓ (11a)	✓	✓	✓
-*t* ACC	✓	✓	(?)	?
-*n* SUP	(?) (11b)	(?)	?	?? (11c)
OBL	?	??	??	*?
PP	??	*?	*	* (11d)

– 3 relevant factors; preferred: light N-case / Pos–non-Pos order / light–**HEAVY** order

(11) • Dependence on the weight of the inflection on N (4 examples out of 20)

    a. Mi   bosszant?
        what annoy.3Sg
        Na   például   [az előzetes egyeztetés nélküli   **meghívása**   a   húgodnak
        arra   az éjfélig   tartó   koncertre], az nagyon bosszant.
        well for_instance the previous agreement without.Adj invitation.Poss.3Sg the sister.Poss.2Sg.Dat
        that.Sub the midnight.Ter lasting concert.Sub that very   annoy.3Sg
        'What annoys you? Well for instance, as for your sister's invitation to that concert lasting until
        midnight, without any previous agreement, *that* annoys me very much.'

b. Min   csodálkozol?
what.Sup surpised_at.2Sg
[(?)]Na például   [az előzetes egyeztetés nélküli   **meghívásá***n*   a   húgodnak
arra   az éjfélig   tartó   koncertre], azon   nagyon csodálkozom.
well for_instance the previous agreement without.Adj invitation.Poss.3Sg.Sup the sister.Poss.2Sg.Dat
that.Sub the midnight.Ter lasting concert.Sub that.Sup very   surprised_at.1Sg
'What are you surprised at? Well for instance, as for your sister's invitation to that concert lasting
until midnight, without any previous agreement, I am very surprised at *that*.'

c. Min   csodálkozol?
what.Sup surpised_at.2Sg
[??]Na például   [a **meghívásá***n*   a koncertre a húgodnak],   azon   nagyon csodálkozom.
well for_instance the invitation.Poss.3Sg.Sup the concert.Sub the sister.Poss.2Sg.Dat that.Sup very   surprised_at.1Sg
'What are you surprised at? Well for instance, as for your sister's invitation to the concert, I am very
surprised at *that*.'

d. Mi   miatt   vagy dühös?
what because_of be.2Sg angry
*Na például [a **meghívása**   *miatt*   a koncertre a húgodnak], amiatt nagyon dühös vagyok.
well for_instance the invitation.Poss.3Sg because_of the concert.Sub the sister.Poss.2Sg.Dat because_of very angry am
intended meaning: 'What are you angry about? Well for instance, as for your sister's invitation to the
concert, I am very angry about *that*.'

3.2 Phonetic balance

– relevant factors: e.g.

heavy N-compl. → $^{*?}$light pre-N zone (12a)~(12b) ("legitimization")
dispreferred: $^{??}$very heavy pre-N zone (12c)~(12b)

(12) • The balance of weight within NP ('What are you interested in nowadays?')

a. $^{*?}$Na például [a **versei**   iránt Adynak a halálról], azok iránt egyre jobban érdeklődöm.
   well for_instance the **poem.Poss.3Sg.Pl** towards Ady.Dat the death.Del that.Pl towards ever more interested_in.1Sg
   intended meaning: 'Well for instance, as for Ady's poems about Death, I am getting more and more
   interested in *those*.'

b. $^{?}$Na például   [az utolsó éveiből   származó,   mostanában népszerűvé váló
   versei   iránt   Adynak a halálról], azok iránt   egyre jobban érdeklődöm.
   well for_instance the last   year.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Ela coming_from nowadays   popular.TrE   becoming
   poem.Poss.3Sg.Pl towards Ady.Dat the death.Del that.Pl towards   ever   more   interested_in.1Sg
   'Well for instance, as for Ady's poems from his last years about Death which nowadays are
   becoming more and more popular, I am getting more and more interested in *those*.'

c. $^{??}$Na például   [Adynak az utolsó éveiből   származó,   mostanában népszerűvé váló,
   a halálról szóló   **versei**   iránt], azok iránt   egyre jobban érdeklődöm.
   well for_instance Ady.Dat the last   year.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Ela coming_from nowadays   popular.TrE becoming
   the death.Del concerning **poem.Poss.3Sg.Pl** towards that.Pl towards ever   more   interested_in.1Sg
   'Well for instance, as for Ady's poems from his last years about Death which nowadays are
   becoming more and more popular, I am getting more and more interested in *those*.'

4. A challenge to Approach III: Anaphora

4.1 Pronoun or Anaphor?

Suppose α and β corefer, and DP^{β} lexically-semantically belongs to N

Approach I (and II?): $[_{VP} ... V ... DP^{\alpha} ... [_{DP} ... N] ... DP^{\beta} ...]$ $\rightarrow DP^{\beta}$ anaphor

Approach III: $[_{VP} ... V ... DP^{\alpha} ... [_{DP} ... N ... DP^{\beta} ...] ...]$ $\rightarrow DP^{\beta}$ pronoun

(13) • *Picture*-type examples $\rightarrow$ Argument for Approach I?

    a. Az idős   művész$^{\alpha}$ készített/festett egy képet   *róla$^{\beta}$ / magáról$^{\beta}$.
       the elderly artist   made/painted.3Sg a   picture.Acc Del.3Sg / himself.Del
       'The elderly artist made / painted a picture of himself.'

    b. Az idős   művész$^{\alpha}$ mutatott   egy régi képet   *róla$^{\beta}$ / magáról$^{\beta}$.
       the elderly artist   showed.3Sg   an   old picture.Acc Del.3Sg / himself.Del
       'The elderly artist showed an old picture of himself.'

Approach III? $[_{VP} ... V ... DP^{\alpha} ... [_{DP} ... N \text{ PRO}^{\gamma} ... DP^{\beta} ...] ...]$;
     – (13a): γ, the Creator, necessarily coincides with α, due to the semantics of V: ✔
     – but (13b)??? $\rightarrow \gamma$ is a "Re-Creator" / "Pseudo-Creator" (pCr) (semantic explanation) ✔
     – that is, 'show' patterns with 'make'/'paint'
     – analogy: *érkezik* 'arrive' patterns with *alakul* 'form' (Szabolcsi 1986):

(14c) Alakult / Érkezett egy / *a kórus. *Definiteness Effect*
     formed / arrived   a / the choir

4.2 Two Factors (out of five): Movement (M) and Explicit Creators (ECr)

Suppose α and β corefer, γ is a different Creator, and **DP^β** lexically-semantically belongs to N

Approach I: [$_{VP}$ ... V ... **DP^α** ... [$_{DP}$ ... **DP^γ** N] ... **DP^β** ...]   → **DP^β** "constantly" anaphor, indep. of M or ECr ???

Approach III: [$_{VP}$ ... V ... **DP^α** ... [$_{DP}$ ... N **DP^γ** ... **DP^β** ...] ...] → ECr → **DP^β** pronoun; M → see Note below

(15)   • Implicit or explicit "creator" *(Note: Pseudo-Creator is "far" (a-b) from its source V/ "close" to it (c))*

   a. Mit mutatott   neked   az idős   művész? *(M)*
      what showed.3Sg Dat.2Sg the elderly artist
      Na   például   azt   a régi képet $^{??}$róla^β/$^{(?)}$magáról^β, azt   csak nagyon vonakodva mutatta   meg.
      well for_instance that.Acc the old picture .Acc Del.3Sg/himself.Del that.Acc only very hestitate.Adv showed.DefObj.3Sg perf
      'What did the elderly artist show you? Well for instance, as for that old picture of him, he was unwilling to show that.'

   b. Mit mutatott   neked   az idős   művész? *(M+ECr)*
      what showed.3Sg Dat.2Sg the elderly artist
      Na   például azt   a régi képedet $^?$róla^β/$^{*?}$magáról^β, azt csak nagyon vonakodva mutatta   meg.
      well for_instance that.Acc the old   picture.Poss.2Sg Del.3Sg/himself.Del that.Acc only very hestitate.Adv showed.DefObj.3Sg perf
      'What did the elderly artist show you? Well for instance, as for your old picture of him, he was unwilling to show that.'

c. Megmutatta neked az idős művész a képeimet a családtagjairól? *(M'+ECr)*
showed.Past.3Sg Dat.2Sg the elderly artist the picture.Poss.Pl.1Sg.Acc the family_member.Poss.3Sg.Pl.Del
Csak a feleségéről / ==*róla^β== / ^(?)magáról^β ==mutatta== meg a ==képed==et.
only the wife.Poss.3Sg.Del / Del.3Sg / himself.Del showed.DefObj.3Sg perf the picture.Poss.2Sg
'Did the elderly artist show you my pictures of his family members? The only picture of yours that he showed me was of his wife / himself.'

4.3 Two further factors: the (semantic) nature of N and V

Approach I: [$_{VP}$ ... V ... **DP^α** ... [$_{DP}$ ... N] ... **DP^β** ...] → **DP^β** anaphor, independently of N and V???
Approach III: [$_{VP}$ ... V ... **DP^α** ... [$_{DP}$ ... N ... **DP^β**...] ...] → **DP^β** pronoun or anaphor, dep. on both N and V
Explanation based on the Pseudo-Creator Hyp.: see below

(16) • The impact of the choice of the N head
a. Az idős művész^α mutatott egy régi **képet** *róla^β / magáról^β.
the elderly artist showed.3Sg an old **picture.Acc** Del.3Sg / himself.Del
'The elderly artist showed an old picture of himself.'

b. Az idős művész^α mutatott egy régi **interjút** *[?]vele^β /*magával^β.
the elderly artist showed an old **interview.Acc** Ins.3Sg / himself.Ins
intended meaning: 'The elderly artist showed an old interview made with him.'

– 'interview' is "more event-like" than 'picture' → not accept a pCr ("proposed" by V) instead of its own Creator

(17)   • The impact of the choice of the matrix V

   a. Az idős   művész$^{\alpha}$ nem tudta **megmutatni** azt   a   régi képet $^{??}$róla$^{\beta}$ / $^{?}$magáról$^{\beta}$.
      the elderly artist   not   could show.Inf   that   the   old   picture.Acc Del.3Sg / himself.Del
      'The elderly artist could not show that old picture of himself.'

   b. Az idős   művész$^{\alpha}$ nem tudta megbocsátani azt   a   régi képet $^{(?)}$róla$^{\beta}$ / *magáról$^{\beta}$.
      the elderly artist   not   could forgive.Inf   that   the   old   picture.Acc Del.3Sg / himself.Del
      'The elderly artist could not forgive me that old picture of him.'

– 'show' is a V that is a "better proponent of a pCr" than 'forgive'
      → the latter cannot "propose" a pCr instead of the own Creator of N

4.4 The fifth factor: the grammatical function of the binder

Approach I: [$_{VP}$ ... V ... **DP$^{\alpha}_{non\text{-}Nom}$** ... [$_{DP}$ ... N] ... **DP$^{\beta}$** ...] → **DP$^{\beta}$** anaphor???
Approach III: [$_{VP}$ ... V ... **DP$^{\alpha}_{Case}$** ... [$_{DP}$ ... N ~~PRO$^{\gamma}$~~... **DP$^{\beta}$**...] ...]   → **DP$^{\beta}$** pronoun
      Explanation based on the Pseudo-Creator Hyp.: only the Subject (Agent?) of V can be "offered" as a pCr

(18) • The binder in an object position

    a. Mi   zaklatta   fel azt az idős színészt?
        what upset.DefObj.3Sg up that the elderly actor.Acc
        Na például   az a régi kép   róla$^{\beta}$ /*magáról$^{\beta}$, az   nagyon felzaklatta.
        well for_instance that the old picture Del.3Sg / himself.Del that very upset.DefObj.3Sg
        'What upset that elderly actor? Well for instance, as for your old picture of him, that upset him very much.'

    b. Az idős színészt$^{\alpha}$ nagyon felzaklatta   az a   régi kép $^{(?)}$róla$^{\beta}$ /*magáról$^{\beta}$.
        the elderly actor.Acc very   upset.DefObj.3Sg that the old picture Del.3Sg / himself.Del
        'Your old picture of him upset the elderly artist very much.'

  c. Mari mindig össze   akar   veszejteni engem veled azokkal a régi képekkel
    *magamról/ $^?$rólam/ *magadról/ $^{(?)}$rólad/ $^?$magáról/ $^{??}$róla/ *magunkról$_{excl.}$ /$^{??}$magunkról$_{incl.}$ /$^?$rólunk$_{excl.}$ /$^{*?}$rólunk$_{incl.}$.
    Mari   always together want.3Sg quarrel   me   Ins.2Sg that.Pl.Ins the old picture.Pl.Ins
    myself.Del /Del.1Sg/ yourself.Del/ Del.2Sg/herself.Del /Del.3Sg/ ourselves.Del / ourselves / Del.1Pl   / Del.1Pl
    'Mari always wants me to have a quarrel with you using those pictures of myself / me / yourself / you / herself / her / ourselves / us.'

    5. Summary

Approach III: accounts for the intricate data;
<mark>Approach I-II: they ought to account for much data</mark>
      As for Case Constraint: vacuous in caseless languages, and otherwise
                  satisfied language-dependently / partially (future research)

Proposed Constituency Test in Hungarian: complete non-exhaustive answer (with contrastive topic)
Further research: DP-internal information structure of arguments?
→ poster by Farkas, Alberti & Szabó (also ICSH11) and our Niš talk.

Alberti Gábor – Medve Anna 2000. Focus Constructions and the "Scope–Inversion Puzzle" in Hungarian. *AtoH* 7. Szeged. 93–118.

Alberti Gábor – Medve Anna 2002/2005. *Generatív grammatikai gyakorlókönyv.* Janus/Books / Gondolat. Budapest.

Bartos Huba 2000. Az inflexiós jelenségek szintaktikai háttere. Kiefer (1992), 653–762.

Broekhuis, Hans & Evelien Keizer & Marcel den Dikken 2012. *Syntax of Dutch – Nouns and Noun Phrases, Vol I-II.* Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.

É. Kiss Katalin 1998. *Mondattan.* É. Kiss Katalin, Kiefer Ferenc és Siptár Péter (szerk.) *Új magyar nyelvtan.* Osiris, Budapest. 15–184.

É. Kiss, Katalin 2009. Is free postverbal order in Hungarian a syntactic or a PF phenomenon? In: Erteschik-Shir, Nomi – Lisa Rochman (eds.) *The Sound Pattern of Syntax.* Oxford Univ. Press.

Kiefer Ferenc szerk. 1992. *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan. I. Mondattan.* Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Kiefer Ferenc szerk. 2000. *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan. I. Morfológia.* Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

Laczkó Tibor 2000. Az ige argumentumszerkezetét megőrző főnévképzés. Kiefer (2000), 293–452.

Lehmann, Christian 1988. On the Function of Agreement, in M. Barlow and Ch. A. Ferguson (eds.) *Agreement in Natural Languages. Approaches, Theories, Descriptions,* CSLI Stanford, 55–65

Lipták, Anikó K. 2011. A fragmentumok mondattana a magyarban. ÁNyT XXIII. 317–349.

Szabolcsi, Anna 1986. From the Definitness Effect to lexical integrity. In *Topic, Focus, and Configurationality.* Benjamins, Amsterdam. 321-348.

Szabolcsi Anna – Laczkó Tibor 1992. A főnévi csoport szerkezete. Kiefer (1992), 179–298.