

HATNÉK-nominalization **in Hungarian**

Judit Farkas¹ and Gábor Alberti²

¹*Research Institute for Linguistics, HAS /*

²*Department of Linguistics, Pécs*

This talk is devoted to the discussion of a very special kind of nominalization, which will be referred to as HATNÉK-nominalization on the basis of the form of its (extremely complex) derivational suffix. Since the topic is scarcely discussed in the literature (e.g., Tompa 1959, 1961), we intend to present a set of data in our talk in order to prove its basic patterning with ÁS-nominalization and Ó-nominalization (Laczkó 2000), which basically correspond to ING- and ER-nominalization in English. Table 1 presents the broader context.

We are grateful to OTKA NK 100804 (*Comprehensive Resource Grammars: Hungarian*) for their financial support. The present scientific contribution is dedicated to the 650th anniversary of the foundation of the University of Pécs, Hungary.

Table 1: **Nominalization types**

TYPE	EXAMPLE
ÁS-nominalization	[Péter <i>meghív-ás-a</i> a koncertre] hiba volt. Péter <i>invite-ÁS-Poss.3Sg</i> the concert.Sub mistake be.Past.3Sg 'Péter's <i>invitation</i> to the concert was a mistake.'
Ó-nominalization	Péter volt [Mari <i>megment-ő-je</i> a sárkánytól]. Péter be.Past.3Sg Mari <i>rescue-Ó-Poss.3Sg</i> the dragon.Ela 'Péter was <i>who has rescued</i> Mari from the dragon.'
T-nominalization	⁽¹⁾ [Amerika <i>felfedez-t-é-vel</i>] új korszak kezdődött. America <i>discover-T-Poss.3Sg-Ins</i> new age begin.Past.3Sg ' <i>With America having been discovered</i> , a new age has begun.' Dóri volt [Péter <i>felfedez-ett-je</i>]. Dóri be.Past.3Sg Péter <i>discover-T-Poss.3Sg</i> 'Dóri was <i>the one discovered by Péter</i> .'
HATNÉK-nominalization	[<i>Énekel-hetnék-em</i>] van. <i>sing-HATNÉK-Poss.1Sg</i> be.3Sg ' <i>I have the desire to sing</i> .'
other kinds of nominalization	<i>te-endő</i> / <i>ir-omány</i> / <i>bizonyít-vány</i> <i>do-ANDÓ</i> / <i>write-MÁNY</i> / <i>certify-VÁNY</i> ' <i>what to do</i> / <i>writing (document)</i> / <i>certificate</i> '

1.1.1.1. General properties of nominalization

This subsection introduces four aspects (I-IV) that is discussed for all types of nominalization in our CGR:H project (Table 1).

I. The form of the derived noun

The subsection devoted to the morphological properties of derived nouns briefly discusses the suffixes used and the distribution and productivity of the morphological processes by which they are derived.

II. The relation of the derived noun to the base verb

The subsection on the relation between the derived noun and the base verb are mainly concerned with the effects of the derivational process, in particular concerning the inheritance of arguments (with the same or with different case marking) and the semantic roles and information-structural functions of these arguments.

In (1) below we provide the smallest inventory of verb types which are typically investigated as potential inputs to nominalization.

- (1) ● Basic **verb types** as inputs to nominalization
- A. VERBS WITHOUT ARGUMENT(S)
- a. Havazik.
snow.3Sg
'It is snowing.'
- B. INTRANSITIVE VERBS
- b. UNERGATIVE VERBS
[Ili]_{Agent} kirándul.
Ili hike
'Ili is hiking.'
- b'. UNACCUSATIVE VERBS
Eltűnt [a kulcs-om]_{Theme}.
disappear.Past.3Sg the key-Poss.1Sg
'My key has disappeared.'

- C. **TRANSITIVE** VERBS
- c. [Ili]_{Agent} épített [egy ház-at]_{Theme}.
 Ili build.Past.3Sg a house-Acc
 ‘Ili built a house.’
- D. VERBS WITH OBLIQUE ARGUMENT(S)
- d. A labda beesett a lyuk-ba.
 the ball fall.Past.3Sg the hole-III
 ‘The ball fell into the hole.’
- d’. Péter beszélgetett Ili-vel Juli-ról.
 Péter talk.Past.3Sg Ili-Ins Juli-Del
 ‘Péter has talked with Ili about Juli.’
- d’’. A boszorkány béká-vá változtatja a herceg-et.
 the witch frog-TrE transform.DefObj.3Sg the prince-Acc
 ‘The witch turns the prince into a frog.’

III. Restrictions on the derivational process

None of the nominalization processes in Table 1 is fully productive in the sense that it can take any (type of) verb as input. Restrictions on the nominalization process relate to the type of input verb and, in some cases, to the thematic role(s) of the argument(s). Different types of deverbal nouns impose different restrictions on the types of the input verbs they allow. For instance, whereas *ÁS*-nominalizations are almost fully productive, the process of *HATNÉK*-nominalization is much more restricted, both in terms of type of input verb and in terms of the thematic role of the subject of the input verb.

There also exist (cross-linguistically) a number of general restrictions on the input verbs that are common to all types of nominalizations. These deviant types (see, for instance, Kenesei 2000:108–111) are summarized here in (2).

- (2) • **Deviant** verb types as inputs to nominalization
- A. Types of *VAN* 'BE'
- a. COPULAR USE
 Péter [bűnös (volt)] / [iskolá-ban van / volt].
 Péter guilty be.Past.3Sg / school-Ine be.3Sg / be.Past.3Sg
 'Péter is/was guilty.' / 'Péter is/was at school.'
- a'. EXISTENTIAL USE
 Van sör a hűtő-ben.
 be.3Sg beer the fridge-Ine
 'There is some beer in the fridge.'
- a". POSSESSIVE USE
 Péter-nek van kutyá-ja.
 Péter-Dat be.3Sg dog-Poss.3Sg
 'Péter has a dog (or more dogs).'
- B. AUXILIARY VERBS
- b. Péter kirándulni fog.
 Péter hike.Inf will.3Sg
 'Péter will hike.'

C. MODAL VERBS

c. Péter tud főzni.
Péter can.3Sg cook.Inf
'Péter can cook.'

c'. Péter-nek főzni(e) kell.
Péter-Dat cook.Inf(3Sg) must
'Péter must cook.'

D. RAISING VERBS

d. Péter beteg-nek tűnik.
Péter ill-Dat seem.3Sg
'Péter seems to be ill.'

E. PSYCH-VERBS

- e. [Péter]_{Experiencer} szereti [ez-t a zené-t]_{Theme}.
 Péter like.DefObj.3Sg this-Acc the music-Acc
 ‘Péter likes this music.’
- e’. [Péter]_{Experiencer} rajong [ez-ért a zené-ért]_{Theme}.
 Péter be_keen_on.3Sg this-Cau the music-Cau
 ‘Péter is keen on this music.’
- e’’. [Péter-t]_{Experiencer} zavarja [ez a zene]_{Theme}.
 Péter-Acc disturb.DefObj.3Sg this the music
 ‘This music disturbs Péter.’
- e’’. [Péter-nek]_{Experiencer} tetszik [ez a zene]_{Theme}.
 Péter-Dat please.3Sg this the music
 ‘This music pleases Péter.’

IV. The degree of verbalness/nominalness of the nominalization

Nominalization results in forms that have the syntactic distribution of nouns. However, these forms retain a number of the syntactic and semantic characteristics of the input verb. They are in a sense a hybrid category, partly nominal and partly verbal. For each type of nominalization, we discuss the degree of verbalness/nominalness partly on the basis of the universal features listed in *SoD-NP* (see Table 8) and partly on the basis of *Hungarian-specific* (*in italics*) and further relevant universal features.

Table 2: *Verbal and nominal characteristics of nominalizations*

VERBAL PROPERTIES	tense and mood
	<i>several person/number paradigms of conjugation</i>
	<i>separability of preverb / verbal modifier</i>
	presence / obligatoriness of arguments
	accusative case-marked argument
	adverbial modification
	<i>information structure (internal scopes)</i>
NOMINAL PROPERTIES	pluralization
	<i>possessive argument</i>
	<i>case marking</i>
	adjectival modification
	definiteness and other degrees of referentiality
	quantification (and determination)

ÁS-nominalization and HATNÉK-nominalization result in significantly more verbal forms than Ó-nominalization and the less productive T-nominalization(s), but, also significantly, less verbal forms than infinitives, in spite of the fact that both ÁS-nouns and infinitives denote states of affairs. It must also be noted in advance that outputs of nominalizations can typically undergo a further, basically conversional, derivation, yielding lexicalized deverbal nominals which are much less verbal and, parallel to this, much more nominal than their inputs (i.e., outputs of the aforementioned “primary” nominalizations).

1.1.1.2. HATNÉK-nominalization

Our main topic is a very special kind of nominalization, which will be referred to as HATNÉK-nominalization in accordance with our terminological practice, on the basis of the form of its (extremely complex) derivational suffix.

It is a fixed inseparable derivational suffix that is attached to the input verb, namely, *-hAtnék* (Tompa 1959). It is not simply the result of the free application of a conversional derivation to arbitrary conditional verb forms; see (3b). This synchronically simplex form coincides with a sequence of three verbal suffixes (3c):

- the permissive modal suffix *-hAt* ‘can’,
- the conditional suffix *-né-*, and
- a number-person suffix *-k*, which refers to the first person suffix in present-day Hungarian but it also has an archaic use as a third person suffix in the special group of *-ik*-verbs.

According to Tompa (1959:482), these three elements coalesced into the present-day deverbal nominalizer.

- (3) ● Introductory illustration of HATNÉK-nominalization
- a. Kiborítasz az állandó lottóz-hatnék-od-dal.
 make_angry.2Sg the permanent play_the_lottery-HATNÉK-Poss.2Sg-Ins
 ‘You make me angry with your permanent desire to play the lottery.’
- b. *Kiborítasz az állandó lottóz-hat-ná-l-od-dal.
 make_angry.2Sg the permanent play_the_lottery-Mod-Cond-2Sg-Poss.2Sg-Ins
 Intended meaning: ‘You make me angry with your permanent desire to play the lottery.’
- c. Állandóan lottóz-hat-né-k, ha lenne elég pénzem.
 permanently play_the_lottery-Mod-Cond-[1/3]Sg if be.Cond.3Sg enough money.Poss.1Sg
 ‘I could play the lottery permanently if I had enough money.’ /
 archaic reading: ‘She/He could play the lottery permanently if I had enough money.’

The data in (4) below prove HATNÉK-nominalization to be (surprisingly) productive since **neologisms** (4a) and **nonsensical** verbs (4b) can readily serve as input.

- (4) • Is HATNÉK-nominalization a **productive** derivation?
- a. Rám jött a **facebookoz-hatnék**.
 Sub.1Sg come.Past.3Sg the facebook-HATNÉK
 ‘I was overcome by *the desire to facebook*.’
- b. Péternek **gorpol-hatnék-ja** támadt ebben a hőségben.
 Péter.Dat gorp-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg come.Past.3Sg this.Ine the heat.Ine
 ‘Péter was overcome by *the desire to gorp* in this heat.’

As for the **meaning** of HATNÉK-nouns, Tompa (1959:485) establishes that they refer to some kind of a **desire** to perform the sort of action denoted by their verbal derivational basis; this kind of meaning is exemplified in (3a) and (4a,b) above. There is also a group of verbs denoting partially controllable actions, typically bodily/sound emissions, in the case of which the HATNÉK-nouns refer to some kind of **urge** (5).

- (5) • HATNÉK-nouns denoting some kind of urge
Nevet-hetnék-em / Tüsszent-hetnék-em / Ásít-hatnék-om van.
laugh-HATNÉK-Poss.1Sg / sneeze-HATNÉK-Poss.1Sg / yawn-HATNÉK-Poss.1Sg be.3Sg
 ‘I have the urge to laugh / sneeze / yawn.’

1.1.1.2.1. *Form of the derived noun*

The derived HATNÉK-nouns always involve the allomorphs *-hatnék* (6a,a',b,e) or *-hetnék* (6c,d), and their use depends on the rules of vowel harmony.

HATNÉK-nouns have the *external distribution of a noun*. The series of examples in (6) serves as an illustration of this fact.

- (6) • The **noun-like external distribution** of HATNÉK-nouns
- a. A zavarodottságom oka a legyőzhetetlen sír-hatnék-om.
 the confusion.Poss.1Sg reason.Poss.3Sg the invincible cry-HATNÉK-Poss.1Sg
 ‘The reason for my confusion is my invincible urge to cry.’
- a’. *Sír-hatnék-om* van.
cry-HATNÉK-Poss.1Sg be.3Sg
 ‘I am having the urge to cry.’
- b. Rám jött a sír-hatnék.
 Sub.1Sg come.Past.3Sg the cry-HATNÉK
 ‘I was overcome by the desire to cry.’
- c. Le tudtad győzni a tüszent-hetnék-ed-et?
 down can.Past.DefObj.2Sg win.Inf the sneeze-HATNÉK-Poss.2Sg-Acc
 ‘Could you suppress your urge to sneeze?’

- d. Péter *legyőzhetetlen tüsszent-hetnék-vel* küzdött.
 Péter *invincible sneeze-HATNÉK-Itis* fight.Past.3Sg
 ‘Péter was fighting *an invincible urge to sneeze.*’
- e. Veszekedés robbant ki Péter *tegnapi kocsmáz-hatnék-ja* miatt.
 quarrel burst.Past.3Sg out Péter *yesterday.Adj go_out_to_pubs-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg because_of*
 ‘A quarrel burst out *because of Péter’s desire to go out to pubs yesterday.*’
 (based on Oszoli 2014:6/(5c))
- e’. Veszekedés robbant ki
 quarrel burst.Past.3Sg out
 Péter *tegnapi, kocsmáz-ás-ról való ábrándoz-ás-a* miatt.
 Péter *yesterday.Adj go_out_to_pubs-ÁS-Del be.Part daydream-ÁS-Poss.3Sg because_of*
 ‘A quarrel burst out *because of Péter’s daydreaming about going out to pubs yesterday.*’

In (6a), there is a HATNÉK-noun used as a primary predicate. Example (6a') illustrates a typical case in which the HATNÉK-noun is also predicative, since, as a verbal modifier, it is the nominal part of a complex predicate. In (6b), a HATNÉK-noun is used as a (nominative case-marked) subject. A HATNÉK-noun can also be used as an (accusative case-marked) object (6c) or as the head of an oblique case-marked noun phrase (6d). It can also be an argument of a postposition (6e).

All the HATNÉK-noun constructions in (6) above can (also) be interpreted as referring to definite desires or urges existing in definite periods of time. In this sense, thus, they can be regarded as **complex-eventuality denoting** deverbal nominal expressions, similar to ÁS-nouns. The potentiality and abstractness that inevitably belongs to the meaning of every HATNÉK-noun, however, suggests that they must be regarded as **event-type-based** nouns; in this respect, thus, they are similar to SED-nouns. Nevertheless, there is no contradiction at all: HATNÉK-nouns can simultaneously be regarded as **event-type-based** and **complex-eventuality denoting** deverbal nominals; we claim that they occupy their place in the system of Hungarian deverbal nominalizers just in this in-between way. In order to elucidate this difficult idea, it is worth fabricating and scrutinizing a whole story around (6e), for instance.

- 6e. Veszekedés robbant ki Péter tegnapi kocsmáz-hatnék-ja miatt.
 quarrel burst.Past.3Sg out Péter yesterday.Adj go_out_to_pubs-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg because_of
 ‘A quarrel burst out *because of Péter’s desire to go out to pubs yesterday.*’
 (based on Oszoli 2014:6/(5c))

Péter’s desire (expressed by the given HATNÉK-noun construction) is an eventuality (an existing state, this time) which lasts, say, from 8 to 10 p.m. in a particular evening, which his wife would like to spend at home watching a romantic film together with her husband. Thus, the denotatum specified in this fabricated story—the state of an existing desire, which could be paraphrased by means of the (complex-event denoting) ÁS-noun construction presented in (6e’)—is a definite complex eventuality (just like the denotatum of the aforementioned ÁS-noun construction). The object of the desire, however, which is the basis of derivation, is an abstract event type of going out to pubs created in Péter’s mind on the basis of his and/or other people’s earlier experiences related to this activity. It is not certain that the complex event of Péter’s going out to pubs in the particular evening has been realized; and even if such a complex event has been realized (contrary to his wife’s desire), the realized complex event is undoubtedly different from the earlier event type in Péter’s mind.

All in all, the HATNÉK-noun construction demonstrated in (6e), together with all the HATNÉK-noun constructions presented in (6), must be taken to be an **event-type-based complex-eventuality denoting deverbal nominal expression**, compared to ÁS-noun constructions, which can be said to be complex-event-based complex-event denoting deverbal nominals, due to the total coincidence of the denotatum and the derivational basis in this group. It is also worth noting that the aforementioned denoted complex eventuality is not the desire itself but the existing desire lasting for a certain period of time.

Do HATNÉK-nouns pattern with ÁS-nouns in having eventuality-type denoting counterparts (cf. *megoperálás* vs. *operáció*)? In other words, are there “HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns”?

YES, but TO SKIP

Let us consider the minimal pair in (7a-a') below. Since the attribute *tegnapi* ‘yesterday.Adj’ in (7a) refers to a definite period of time, the given HATNÉK-noun construction is to be interpreted as a complex-eventuality denoting expression. As is exemplified in (7a'), however, this attribute can easily be replaced with one that refers to a vague discontinuous temporal entity (e.g., *állandó* ‘constant’), which is straightforwardly incompatible with complex-eventuality denoting constructions but compatible with eventuality-type denoting ones. Nevertheless, note that there is no such difference between the phonetic forms of the two deverbal nouns in question as, for instance, the spectacular formal difference between the complex-event denoting ÁS-noun *megoperálás* ‘perf.operate.ÁS’ and its event-type denoting (blocking) SED-noun counterpart *operáció* ‘operation’. This makes it necessary to provide further evidence for the independent existence of a group of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns.

(7) ● Are there eventuality-type denoting HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns?

- a. Péter tegnap kocsmáz-hatnék-ja mindenkit kiborított.
 Péter yesterday.Adj go_out_to_pubs-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg everyone.Acc make_angry.Past.3Sg
 ‘Péter’s urge to go out to pubs yesterday made everyone angry.’
- a’. Péter állandó kocsmáz-hatnék-ja mindenkit kiborít.
 Péter constant go_out_to_pubs-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg everyone.Acc make_angry.3Sg
 ‘Péter’s constant urge to go out to pubs makes everyone angry.’
- b. [?]Ez volt a hét leglegyőzhetlenebb sír-hatnék-ja.
 this be.Past.3Sg the week most_invincible cry-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘This was the week’s most invincible urge to cry.’
- b’. *Ez volt Ili kedvenc nevet-hetnék-je.
 this be.Past.3Sg Ili favorite laugh-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 Intended meaning: ‘This was Ili’s favorite occasion when someone had the urge to laugh.’

- c. Rám tört a sír-hatnék.
 Sub.1Sg come_over.Past.3Sg the cry-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘I was overcome by the desire to cry.’
- d. ^{??}Régóta kutatják a sír-hatnék okait.
 for_a_long_time investigate.DefObj.3Pl the cry-HATNÉK reason.Poss.Pl.Acc
 ‘Reasons for the urge to cry have been investigated for a long time.’
- d’. [?]A sír-hatnék az egyik legrosszabb érzés.
 the cry-HATNÉK the one_of worst feeling
 ‘The urge to cry is one of the worst feelings.’
- e. [Az oroszlán]_{Agent/*Theme} simogat-hatnék-ja mindenkit megdöbentett.
 the lion stroke-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg everyone.Acc shock.Past.3Sg
 meaning1 [Agent]: ‘The lion’s urge to stroke shocked everyone.’
 meaning2 [Theme] (intended): ‘The urge to stroke the lion shocked everyone.’
- e’. [Az oroszlán]_{Agent/Theme} simogat-ás-a mindenkit megdöbentett.
 the lion stroke-ÁS-Poss.3Sg everyone.Acc shock.Past.3Sg
 ‘The stroke of the lion_[Agent/Theme] shocked everyone.’

Let us consider the test contexts which proved successful in distinguishing SED-nouns from ÁS-nouns. They all have to do with the possessor in some way. There is a decisive property shared by all complex-eventuality denoting deverbal nominal constructions: they cannot dispense with an (at least reconstructable) possessor that corresponds to an unambiguously designated (non-oblique case-marked) input argument, that is, to the object or to the subject. An eventuality-type denoting deverbal nominal construction can contain no possessor at all, or it can contain a possessor which is in such a loose semantic relation to the noun as a temporal expression, for instance. Moreover, if the construction contains the expression *kedvenc* ‘favorite’, the semantic relation of the possessor to the eventuality is practically totally arbitrary.

Let us start the overview with the “temporal possessor test”. Example (7b) above, with its grammaticality judgment ‘?’, can be accepted as an argument for the independent existence of a group of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns. The ‘favorite’-construction, however, is not compatible with *hAtnék*-nouns (7b’); the reason may be a general semantic incompatibility between desires/urges and the ‘favorite’-construction (cf. **my favorite thirst*).

The example in (7c) suggests that a *hAtnék*-noun can easily dispense with a possessor; the grammaticality judgments ('?/?') associated with (7d-d'), however, show that the question is not so simple. How can this contradiction be reconciled?

Let our point of departure be the observation that there are no *hAtnék*-nouns in (traditional) dictionaries. On the basis of this, we can hypothesize that there are no *lexicalized* HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns. If this is true, the questionable status of the possessorless (7d-d') examples is not surprising but it is in total harmony with the plausible assumption that a deverbal nominal can only be regarded as an item of the lexicon if it can occur (in well-formed sentences) "freely", and not with an obligatory possessor (NB: such relational nouns as *anya* 'mother' and *szél* 'edge' are absolute roots).

Note, however, that the assumption that there are no lexicalized HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns does not exclude a hypothesis according to which speakers always create HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns “on-line”. That is, in contrast to SED-nouns, the group of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns may be assumed to have the special property of containing no core subgroup of lexicalized elements, which may have to do with the following observation: there are no lexical items which can straightforwardly be regarded as irregularly derived (“blocking”) HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns. The examples in (8) below support this claim by illustrating that only quite complex expressions can serve as more or less adequate synonyms for HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns, and not simple formal alternatives with the same verbal root but with a single different nominalizing derivational suffix. Only example (8c) might be evaluated as a blocking form according to our practice applied so far: here a combination of two derivational suffixes can be taken to serve as a substitute for *-hAtnék*. The interchangeability of the given phonetic forms, however, are problematic, as is illustrated in (8c’); the difference between the HATNÉK_{SED}-noun and the noun *aluszékonyság* ‘somnialece’ is similar to that difference between *részeg* ‘drunk’ and *részeges* ‘alcoholic’.

- (8) ● No blocking forms in the case of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns?
- a. *nevet-hetnék* versus *röhög-ő-görcs*
laugh-HATNÉK *guffaw-ó-cramp*
 ‘*urge to laugh* versus *convulsions*’
- b. *vizel-hetnék* versus *vizel-és-i inger*
urinate-HATNÉK *urinate-ÁS-Adj urgency*
 ‘*urge to urinate* versus *urinary urgency*’
- c. *al-hatnék* versus *alusz-ékony-ság*
sleep-HATNÉK *sleep-Adj-Nmn*
 ‘*urge to sleep* versus *somnolence*’
- c’. Sokaknak gyakran *al-hatnék-ja* / **alusz-ékony-ság-a* van.
 many.Pl.Dat often *sleep-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg* / *sleep-Adj-Nmn-Poss.3Sg* be.3Sg
 ‘Many always have [*an urge to sleep*] / *somnolence*.’

We hypothesize, thus, that the group of SED-nouns represents the default case with its (huge) subgroup consisting of lexicalized elements (NB: all irregularly derived SED-nouns are *per se* lexicalized). Even this group, however, must contain non-lexicalized, that is, “on-line created”, elements, simply because lexicalization is a process, and processes must inevitably have transitory phases (in which the given potential phonetic forms are acceptable in certain sentential contexts but are still not items of the lexicon of speakers of Hungarian. The peculiar property of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns, thus, is that this group exclusively consists of elements to be created on-line, just like the complex-eventuality denoting groups (of ÁS-nouns and HATNÉK-nouns).

Let us now return to example (7c), in which the *hAtnék*-noun seems to dispense with a possessor. It must be noted, however, that the possessor is to be reconstructed; which means that the given deverbal nominal construction is created on-line. We need not decide at this point whether it is a complex-eventuality denoting HATNÉK-noun construction—with an implicit possessor (which must be reconstructed, by identifying it with the sublative case-marked argument of the verb), or a HATNÉK_{SED}-noun construction, which (also) requires a possessor in connection with its non-lexicalized status but a reconstructable possessor is sufficient.

The minimal pair in (7e-e') above shows that *hAtnék*-nouns do not pattern with *Ás*-nouns in producing ambiguity in their eventuality-type-based versions: the possessor of a transitive-verb-based *hAtnék*-noun can never correspond to the input Theme; it seems to “insist” on the Agent, or “at least” on an argument whose role contains a certain amount of agentivity (cf. (22c”,d) in 1.1.1.2.2.3 (Dowty 1991)). Nevertheless, the absence of ambiguity in the case of the *hAtnék*-noun construction exemplified in (7e) does not *ab ovo* exclude the HATNÉK_{SED}-noun status, but can be regarded as a consequence of the aforementioned non-lexicalized character. The on-line-createdness may imply that the possessor cannot be chosen as freely as in the case of free lexical items but only certain embedding constructions license potential HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns. Observe that the temporal-possessor construction, exemplified in (7b) above, belongs to such licensing contexts of (on-line created) HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns. As a matter of fact, this context is the only one (so far) on the basis of which (potential) HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns can quite reliably be distinguished from HATNÉK-nouns.

Moreover, this context is the only one so far on the basis of which the mere existence of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns can be raised at all. Let us thus use temporal possessors in our tests to ensure that given *hAtnék*-nouns are undoubtedly HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns.

Another potential test to distinguish HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns and HATNÉK-nouns is the [postposition + *való*] test, which Laczkó (2000a:316–318) used to distinguish ÁS-nouns from SED-nouns. Recall that this test relies on the specialty of Hungarian that postpositions can be attributivized by means of either the *-i* suffix, an adjectival derivational suffix, or the separate word *való*, one of the present participial counterparts of the copula *van* ‘be’. This latter construction unambiguously evokes the complex-event reading among ÁS-nouns if (and only if) the former construction is also available.

Let us now investigate what the [postposition + *való*] test indicates in the case of *hAtnék*-nouns (9). The minimal pair in the (a)-examples demonstrates that HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns pattern with SED-nouns (9b’) in rejecting the [postposition + *való*] construction (9a) while accepting the [postposition + *-i*] construction (9a’).

- (9) • The application of the [postposition + *való*] test to *hAtnék*-nouns (compared to the case of *ÁS*- and *SED*-nouns)
- a. ^{*3}Ez volt az év leglegyőzhetetlenebb ebéd után való beszélget-hetnék-je.
 this be.Past.3Sg the year most_invincible lunch after be.Part talk-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘This was *the year’s most invincible urge to talk after the lunch.*’
- a’. ⁽²⁾Ez volt az év leglegyőzhetetlenebb ebéd utáni beszélget-hetnék-je.
 this be.Past.3Sg the year most_invincible lunch after.Adj talk-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘This was *the year’s most invincible urge to talk after the lunch.*’
- b. *Ilinek az ebéd [után való] / ⁽²⁾utáni meg-operál-ás-a jól sikerült.*
Ili.Dat the lunch after be.Part / after.Adj perf-operate-ÁS-Poss.3Sg well succeed.Past.3Sg
 ‘*Operating Ili after lunch succeeded.*’
- b’. *Ilinek az ebéd *[után való] / ⁽²⁾utáni operáció-ja jól sikerült.*
Ili.Dat the lunch after be.Part / after.Adj operation-ÁS-Poss.3Sg well succeed.Past.3Sg
 ‘*Ili’s operation after lunch succeeded.*’
- c. Ránk tört az ebéd [után való] / ^{*3}utáni beszélget-hetnék.
 Sub.1Pl come_over.Past.3Sg the lunch after be.Part / after.Adj talk-HATNÉK
 ‘We were overcome by *a desire to talk after the lunch.*’ (complex eventuality)
- c’. Ránk tört az ebéd *[után való] / ⁽²⁾utáni beszélget-hetnék.
 Sub.1Pl come_over.Past.3Sg the lunch after be.Part / after.Adj talk-HATNÉK
 ‘We were overcome by *the [usual] desire to talk after the lunch.*’ (eventuality type)

Do HATNÉK-nouns pattern with ÁS-nouns (9b) in accepting both postpositional constructions? This question cannot be answered easily due to the fact that, in the case of a *hAtnék*-noun construction exempt from a temporal possessor, a HATNÉK-noun cannot be distinguished from its potential HATNÉK_{SED}-noun counterpart for the following reasons: (i) as was claimed above, they are inevitably homophonous due to on-line creation, that is, there are no such spectacular differences as the one between, for instance, the complex-event denoting ÁS-noun *megoperálás* ‘perf.operate.ÁS’ and its (irregularly derived, “blocking”) event-type denoting SED-noun counterpart *operáció* ‘operation’ in (9b-b’); (ii) a human possessor is inevitably to be interpreted in both types as an Agent (and it cannot be interpreted as a Theme).

The examples (9c-c') above suggests a negative answer to the aforementioned question, because the *hAtnék*-noun interpretation evoked by the [postposition + *-i*] construction (9c') is slightly different from that evoked by the [postposition + *való*] construction (9c). As the translations show, in (9c) a definite desire is referred to without any antecedent, while in (9c') the type of chats after lunch is presupposed. An example of this latter case can be a situation in which a boss is often angry with his/her subordinates for spending much time chatting after lunch. The example in (9c) evokes no similar presupposition but it can be performed "out of the blue"; so it definitely refers to an individual complex eventuality. The alternative variant (9c'), however, primarily refers to the aforementioned eventuality type, and the reference to the definite complex eventuality of the existing desire is due to the matrix verbal construction (*rám tört...* '... came over me'). We argue (on the basis of this construal) that this difference is suitable for distinguishing HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns from each other: the [postposition + *való*] construction is compatible only with HATNÉK-nouns, while the [postposition + *-i*] construction is compatible only with HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns.

As in the case of *ÁS*-nouns and *Ó*-nouns, the preverbs of input verbs are worth investigating here, too. Do the “meaningless” (i.e., exclusively perfectivizing) input preverbs behave differently from the “meaningful” ones?

As is illustrated in the series of examples in (10), *HATNÉK*-nouns inherit both kinds of preverbs. Constructions containing exclusively perfectivizing preverbs are somewhat marked (10b’), presumably due to the eventuality-type derivational basis of all types of *hAtnék*-nouns. Nevertheless, as the translation given in (10b’) suggests, preserving the preverb is the single solution in cases in which the speaker wants to express exactly the accomplishment of an activity as the object of the desire in question.

(10) ● Verbal modifiers in the case of HATNÉK-nouns

- a. ⁽²⁾Marira rátört *az ok nélkül való vissza-beszél-hetnék.*
 Mari.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg *the reason without be.Part back-speak-HATNÉK*
 ‘Mari was overcome by *the desire to talk back without reasons.*’
- b. ⁽²⁾Marira rátört *az óra alatt való fésülköd-hetnék.*
 Mari.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg *the lesson under be.Part comb_oneself-HATNÉK*
 ‘Mari was overcome by *the desire to comb herself during the lesson.*’
- b’. [?]Marira rátört *az ebéd előtt való meg-fésülköd-hetnék.*
 Mari.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg *the lunch before be.Part perf-comb_oneself-HATNÉK*
 ‘Mari was overcome by *the desire to do her hair by combing herself before lunch.*’

Note in passing that the slightly marked status ('(?)') of the preverbless construction in (10b) and the example in (10a) with a meaningful preverb can be attributed to the *való*-construction inserted in the given sentences in order to ensure the HATNÉK-noun interpretation. That is, the *ab ovo* fully acceptable constructions become somewhat awkward exactly due to the test situation.

Let us also investigate the question of preverb inheritance in the case of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns (11). As is expected, HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns inherit the meaningful preverb (11a), while preserving the exclusively perfectivizing preverb is a highly marked option here (11b'), which is in total harmony with their eventuality-type denoting character. The fact that the given HATNÉK_{SED}-noun construction is not fully unacceptable may have to do with its "on-line created" status.

(11) ● Verbal modifiers in the case of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns

- a. ⁽²⁾Ez volt az év leglegyőzhetetlenebb vissza-beszél-hetnék-je.
 this be.Past.3Sg the year most_invincible back-talk-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘This was *the year’s most invincible urge to talk back.*’
- b. ⁽²⁾Ez volt az év leglegyőzhetetlenebb fésülköd-hetnék-je.
 this be.Past.3Sg the year most_invincible comb_oneself-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘This was *the year’s most invincible urge to comb oneself.*’
- b’. ^{??}Ez volt az év leglegyőzhetetlenebb meg-fésülköd-hetnék-je.
 this be.Past.3Sg the year most_invincible perf-comb_oneself-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘This was *the year’s most invincible urge to do one’s hair by combing oneself.*’

We conclude this subsection with the question of whether *hAtnék*-nouns can be further derived. This question is of importance because there is a natural relationship between the possibility of readily serving as derivational input and being a lexical (and not “on-line created”) item. We argue that *hAtnék*-nouns cannot serve as input to (further) derivation, as is illustrated in (12a). This observation can be regarded as another argument in favor of their peculiar property that even HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns are uniformly „on-line created” (NB: on-line-createdness does not totally exclude further-derivability but can be regarded as a factor that decreases its likelihood or readiness).

(12) ● Further-derivation of HATNÉK-nouns?

- a. **nevet-hetnék-ség* / **nevet-hetnék-es* / **nevet-hetnék-ű* / **nevet-hetnék-i*
laugh-HATNÉK-Nmn / *laugh-HATNÉK-Adj* / *laugh-HATNÉK-Adj* / *laugh-HATNÉK-Adj*
- b. *csókolóz-hatnék-ság* / *indul-hatnék-ú* / *vereked-hetnék-i*
kiss_each_other-HATNÉK-Nmn / *depart-HATNÉK-Adj* / *fight-HATNÉK-Adj*
 (Tompa 1959:484)

Note in passing that Tompa (1959:484) gave a few further-derived *hAtnék*-nouns, exemplified in (12b) above. On the basis of our mother tongue competence, however, we definitely claim that such expressions are totally unacceptable in present-day Hungarian (see also Oszoli 2014:7). Nevertheless, there may be great speaker-dependent differences in accepting such further-derived *hAtnék*-nouns (especially in certain genres).

1.1.1.2.2. *Relation to the base verb*

This subsection outlines to what extent such verbal properties as argument structure (1.1.1.2.2.1) and information structure (1.1.1.2.2.2) are inherited in the case of *hAtnék*-nouns; and how the type of the input verb affects this inheritance (1.1.1.2.2.3).

1.1.1.2.2.1. Argument-structure inheritance

In the case of *hAtnék*-nouns, the following generalization can be formulated, at least as a “theoretical possibility” (and not as an actual practice), for both subtypes (due to the fact that even the eventuality-type denoting HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns are on-line created). Apart from the change in syntactic category (from V to N), the number, the obligatory or optional character, and the thematic function of the arguments tend to remain essentially the same, with the usual exception: the non-oblique syntactic functions must change, due to the change in syntactic category, in connection with the general fact that a noun has no subject and object, but only a position for a possessor—and an additional position in the prenominal complement zone for a non-fully-fledged argument.

First, let us consider HATNÉK-nouns, which are special just in respect of the aforementioned constraint on non-oblique-case-marked arguments: it is always the **Agent(-like) input subject** that corresponds to the possessor, which is either explicitly present (13a-a') or reconstructable in the sense that it must be identified with a certain argument within the clause (for instance, with the accusative case-marked argument in (13b), and with the sublative case-marked one in (13b')). Note that in the case of a reconstructable possessor (13b-b'), the HATNÉK-noun bears neither a possessedness suffix nor an agreement suffix. As for the former case, either the possessor appears within the HATNÉK-noun construction (13a), or it is separated from its possessee (13a'). Having recourse to a "split construction" is obligatory in the case typical of HATNÉK-nouns, in which the HATNÉK-noun construction serves as a verbal modifier (cf. (13a') and (13a'')) since this kind of verbal modifier is obligatorily non-fully-fledged.

- (13) ● The **inheritance of argument structure** in the case of HATNÉK-nouns:
 I. Non-oblique-case-marked arguments: input subject
- a. A kudarc oka *Ili legyőzhetetlen sír-hatnék-ja* volt.
 the failure reason.Poss.3Sg *Ili invincible cry-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg* be.Past.3Sg
 ‘The reason for the failure was *Ili*’s *invincible urge to cry*.’
- a’. *Julinak* is sajnós *sír-hatnék*(-ja)* van.
Juli.Dat also unfortunately *cry-HATNÉK(-Poss.3Sg)* be.3Sg
 ‘Unfortunately, *Juli* is also having *the urge to cry*.’
- a’’. *[*Juli sír-hatnék-ja*] van.
Juli cry-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg be.3Sg
 Intended meaning: ‘*Juli* is having *the urge to cry*.’
- b. Pétert elfogta *a sír-hatnék(*-ja)*.
Péter.Acc seize.Past.DefObj.3Sg *the cry-HATNÉK(-Poss.3Sg)*
 ‘Péter was seized by *the desire to cry*.’
- b’. Rám jött *a sír-hatnék(*-om)*.
 Sub.1Sg come.Past.3Sg *the cry-HATNÉK(-Poss.3Sg)*
 ‘I was overcome by *the desire to cry*.’

With the input subject obligatorily corresponding to the possessor of the HATNÉK-noun, what happens to the input object (if the input verb is transitive)?

The fully unacceptable example in (14a'), based on an argument-structure type with a fully fledged object (14a), corroborates the aforementioned generalization: the input object cannot appear as the possessor in a HATNÉK-noun construction even if this construction does not contain an (explicit) possessor. As is exemplified in (14a''), a fully fledged input object cannot appear (either with or without accusative case suffix) in the prenominal complement zone of a HATNÉK-noun, either.

All in all, fully fledged input objects cannot appear within HATNÉK-noun constructions in any way—at least preserving their fully fledged character.

- (14) ● The inheritance of argument structure in the case of HATNÉK-nouns:
 II. Non-oblique-case-marked arguments: input object
- a. Ili (meg-)simogatja azt az oroszlánt.
 Ili (perf-)stroke.DefObj.3Sg that.Acc the lion.Acc
 ‘Ili strokes / is stroking that lion.’
- a’. *Ilire rájött annak a oroszlánnak a simogat-hatnék-ja.
 Ili.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg that.Dat the lion.Dat the stroke-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 Intended meaning: ‘Ili was overcome by the desire to stroke that lion.’
- a’’. *Ilire rájött
 Ili.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg
 az [azt az oroszlánt] / [az az oroszlán] simogat-hatnék.
 the that.Acc the lion.Acc / that the lion stroke-HATNÉK
 Intended meaning: ‘Ili was overcome by the desire to stroke that lion.’
- b. Ili éppen oroszlán(oka)t / *Bömbit simogat.
 Ili just lion.(Pl.)Acc / Bömbi.Acc stroke.3Sg
 ‘Ili is stroking lions / Bömbi.’
- b’. Ilire rájött az oroszlán-simogat-hatnék.
 Ili.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg the lion-stroke-HATNÉK
 ‘Ili was overcome by the desire to stroke lions.’
- b’’. Ilire rájött a legyőzhetetlen[?](*a) Bömbi-simogat-hatnék.
 Ili.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg the invincible the Bömbi-stroke-HATNÉK
 ‘Ili was overcome by the invincible desire to stroke Bömbi.’

As the example in (14b') above illustrates, however, the input object can appear in the prenominal complement zone of the HATNÉK-noun if it is based on a transitive argument-structure type with a non-fully-fledged object (14b).

Example (14b'') presents a quite acceptable ('?') exceptional case, in which the counterpart of a fully fledged object (*Bömbi*) appears in the prenominal complement zone of a HATNÉK-noun. Note, however, that the given type of examples has a somewhat funny connotation, to which the licensing of the slight violation of our generalization on fully fledged input objects can be attributed, in addition to the following strange in-between status of personal names. Semantically, they are definite expressions, but they dispense with the definite article (on a register- or dialect-dependent basis), so formally, they "look like" bare nouns, and bare nouns can readily occupy prehead positions (14b-b').

This special latter phenomenon suggests the following "fine-tuning" of our basic generalization on argument-structure inheritance of HATNÉK-noun constructions: the obligatoriness of certain input arguments (see the accusative case-marked proper name in (14b)) is "inherited" in a "weakened" way. In this particular case, a fully fledged input argument is licensed to correspond to a "positionally non-fully-fledged" output argument. In another type of cases, illustrated in (15b-b') below, this "weakening" manifests itself as follows: while in the input verbal construction at least one of the possible oblique case-marked arguments is expected to be present in an "out-of-the-blue" context (cf. (15b) and (15c)), the corresponding HATNÉK-noun construction entirely dispenses with them (15b').

Compared to these cases that “weaken” the basic rule (according to which obligatorily input arguments must correspond to obligatorily appearing output arguments), the (a)-examples in (15) below illustrate the default case as follows. The verbal construction given in (15a) is fully unacceptable unless the sublative case-marked argument is present or reconstructable; and the corresponding HATNÉK-noun construction is also unacceptable (or perhaps very slightly less unacceptable) without the output counterpart of the sublative case-marked argument.

- (15) ● The inheritance of argument structure in the case of HATNÉK-nouns:

III. Oblique-case-marked arguments

- a. Péter rá-lőtt ^{*}([✓]a medvére).
 Péter onto-shoot.Past.3Sg the bear.Sub
 ‘Péter shot at it / the bear.’ (intended meaning: “out-of-the-blue”)
- a’. Péterre rájött *a* ^{*?}([?]medvére való) rá-lő-hetnék.
 Péter.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg the bear.Sub be.Part onto-shoot-HATNÉK
 ‘Péter was overcome by *the desire to shoot (at the bear).*’
- b. [?]Ili gyakran beszélget.
 Ili often talk.3Sg
 ‘Ili often talks.’
- b’. Ilire rájött *a* beszélget-hetnék.
 Ili.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg the talk-HATNÉK
 ‘Ili was overcome by *the desire to talk.*’

- c. Ili gyakran beszélget Marival a politikáról.
 Ili often talk.3Sg Mari.Ins the politics.Del
 ‘Ili often talks with Mari about politics.’
- c’. Ili rájött *a beszélget-hetnék Marival*^(?)(^{??}*a politikáról*).
 Ili.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg the talk-HATNÉK Mari.Ins the politics.Del
 ‘Ili was overcome *the desire to talk with Mari (about politics).*’
- d. Ili rájött *a Marival /politikáról való beszélget-hetnék*.
 Ili.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg the Mari.Ins /politics.Del be.Part talk-HATNÉK
 ‘Ili was overcome by *the desire to talk [with Mari] / [about politics].*’
- d’. Ili rájött *a Marival*^{??}(**való*) *a politikáról való beszélget-hetnék*.
 Ili.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg the Mari.Ins be.Part the politics.Del be.Part talk-HATNÉK
 ‘Ili was overcome by *the desire to talk [with Mari] [about politics].*’

- e. [?]Ilire rájött *a politikáról való beszélget-hetnék Marival.*
 Ili.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg *the politics.Del* *be.Part* talk-HATNÉK *Mari.Ins*
 ‘Ili was overcome by *the desire to talk [with Mari] [about politics].*’
- f. *Beszélget-hetnék-em* támadt *Marival* ^(?)([?]*a politikáról*).
talk-HATNÉK-Poss.1Sg come_over.Past.3Sg *Mari.Ins* *the politics.Del*
 ‘I was overcome by *the desire to talk with Mari (about politics).*’
- g. Elfogott *a Pécsre utaz-hatnék.*
 seize.Past.3Sg *the Pécs.Sub* travel-HATNÉK-Poss.1Sg
 ‘I was seized by *the desire to travel to Pécs.*’

While it is “less obligatory” to express (the output counterparts of) the oblique case-marked arguments in HATNÉK-noun constructions, on the one hand, there is another (actually parallel) tendency according to which such arguments are sometimes not easy to express, on the other. Let us consider the decisive factors of this tendency. Our point of departure is a (fully acceptable) verbal construction containing two arguments in its postnominal complement zone (15c).

Such variants are tested in (15c') above in which the complement zone is fully or partly preserved. The grammaticality judgments show that it is almost impossible for both arguments to appear in the postnominal complement zone, and even the appearance of one of the oblique case-marked arguments yields a slight degree of markedness.

The *való*-construction seems to offer an optimal solution for expressing an oblique case-marked argument within HATNÉK-noun constructions (15d). The *való*-construction, however, is practically unsuitable for hosting more than one (oblique case-marked) arguments (15d'): stacking two or more *való*-constructions is fully unacceptable but stacking two or more arguments in one *való*-construction is highly marked, too.

It is possible to mix the aforementioned solutions by placing one of the arguments in a *való*-construction and the other in the postnominal complement zone (15e). This is the best strategy, since the given example is quite acceptable though still not perfect ('?').

In certain cases (15f), a HATNÉK-noun construction must be split (cf. (13a’), due to its serving as a verbal modifier, whose position is one of the positions in Hungarian that rejects right branching from head; see also Alberti, Farkas and Szabó (2015:9–14). The oblique case-marked arguments of the HATNÉK-noun appear in this way postverbally, yielding a word-order variant that is as acceptable as the best, “mixed”, solution, illustrated in (15e), in spite of the fact that this solution is not based on a mixed strategy of placing oblique case-marked arguments (cf. the highly marked example in (15c’) above). A possible explanation for this surprisingly acceptable status of the variant in (15f) is the (somewhat theory-dependent) assumption that the split arguments in question are hosted in the postnominal complement zone of the verb, whose filling is not subject to any constraint (15c).

Finally, if an oblique case-marked argument serves as a verbal modifier in the input verbal construction, its output counterpart can readily be hosted in the prenominal complement zone of the derived HATNÉK-noun (15f).

Let us now turn to the question of argument-structure inheritance in the case of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns. One of the basic rules of correspondence among input and output dependents is that the output possessor, whose (at least reconstructable) presence is obligatory (presumably due to the “on-line created” character of both types of *hAtnék*-nouns) can either correspond to the (Agent-like) input subject (16) or be a temporal expression (17).

As the grammaticality judgments associated with the examples in (16) below illustrate, this subtype of HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions patterns with HATNÉK-noun constructions (13-15), presumably due to their shared “on-line created” character with the output possessor corresponding to the (Agent-like) input subject (16a-a’).

As for the details, this subtype of HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions also patterns with HATNÉK-noun constructions in the following respect: the possessor is either explicitly present (16a) or reconstructable by being identified with a certain argument within the clause (for instance, with the sublative case-marked argument in (16a’)). In the latter case (16a’), the HATNÉK_{SED}-noun bears neither a possessedness suffix nor an agreement suffix (cf. (13b’)).

- (16) ● The inheritance of argument structure in the case of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns I.
- a. *Ilinek időnként legyőzhetetlen sír-hatnék-ja szokott lenni.*
Ili.Dat from_time_to_time invincible cry-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg used_to.Past.3Sg be.Inf
 ‘From time to time *Ili* has an invincible urge to cry.’
- a’. *Ilire már megint rájött a legyőzhetetlen sír-hatnék.*
Ili.Sub already again come_over.Past.3Sg the invincible cry-HATNÉK
 ‘The invincible urge came over *Ili* again to cry.’
- b. *Ilire már megint rájött a legyőzhetetlen oroszlán-simogat-hatnék.*
Ili.Sub already again come_over.Past.3Sg the invincible lion-stroke-HATNÉK
 ‘*Ili* was overcome again by the invincible desire to cry.’
- c. *Ilire már megint rájött a legyőzhetetlen*
Ili.Sub already again come_over.Past.3Sg the invincible
[?]*[beszélget-hetnék Marival] / ^(?)[Marival való beszélget-hetnék].*
talk-HATNÉK Mari.Ins / Mari.Ins be.Part talk-HATNÉK
 ‘*Ili* was overcome again by the invincible desire to talk with *Mari*.’
- c’. [?]*Ilire már megint rájött a legyőzhetetlen*
Ili.Sub already again come_over.Past.3Sg the invincible
politikáról való beszélget-hetnék Marival.
politics.Del be.Part talk-HATNÉK Mari.Ins
 ‘*Ili* was overcome again by the invincible desire to talk with *Mari* about politics.’
- c’’. *Ilire már megint rájött a legyőzhetetlen Pécsre utaz-hatnék.*
Ili.Sub already again come_over.Past.3Sg the invincible Pécs.Sub travel-HATNÉK
 ‘*Ili* was overcome again by the invincible desire to travel to Pécs.’

An input object can have a counterpart in a HATNÉK_{SED}-noun construction on condition that it is not fully fledged (16b), because it can appear only in the (output) prenominal complement zone (see the comments on (14) above).

As for oblique case-marked input arguments, they can, and must, be inherited in the case of HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions (16c-c'), just like in the case of HATNÉK-noun constructions, and according to the same conditions and strategies. If a single oblique case-marked argument is involved, it can quite readily appear in the (output) postnominal complement zone, and even more readily in a *való*-construction (16c). If there is more than one oblique case-marked argument in the input, the best strategy to place them in the output HATNÉK_{SED}-noun construction is the “mixed” strategy (see (16c'); cf. (15e)). This subtype of HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions also patterns with HATNÉK-noun constructions in readily inheriting an oblique case-marked input verbal modifier, by hosting it in the prenominal complement zone (see (16c''); cf. (15g)).

The subtype of HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions in which the possessor corresponds to a temporal expression, presented in (17a), uniformly shows a one grade lower level of acceptability with the same kinds of input verbal constructions; see the examples in (17c-d”).

First of all, however, let us consider (17b) below, which illustrates the fact that the input subject cannot have an output counterpart in the given HATNÉK_{SED}-noun subtype, with the possessor being a temporal expression and the prenominal complement zone not being capable of hosting it (presumably due to the Agent-like character of the argument in question).

As is illustrated in (17c), however, the input object can readily occupy the aforementioned prenominal complement zone, on condition that it is not fully fledged. In this respect, thus, this HATNÉK_{SED}-noun construction subtype also patterns with HATNÉK-noun constructions (14b’); see also (16b).

- (17) ● The inheritance of argument structure in the case of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns:
 II. Constructions with temporal possessors
- a. Ez volt az évtized leglegyőzhetetlenebb [...].
 this be.Past.3Sg the decade most_invincible
 ‘This was *the decade’s* most invincible urge/desire [...].’
- b. [?](*gyermek-)-sír-hatnék-ja
 (child-)cry-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘(for children) to cry’
- c. [?]oroszlán-simogat-hatnék-ja
 lion-stroke-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘to stroke lions’
- d. ^{??}[beszélget-hetnék-je Marival] / [?][Marival való beszélget-hetnék-je]
 talk-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg Mari.Ins / Mari.Ins be.Part talk-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘to talk with Mari’
- d’. ^{??}politikáról való beszélget-hetnék-je Marival
 politics.Del be.Part talk-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg Mari.Ins
 ‘to talk with Mari about politics’
- d’’. [?]Pécsre utaz-hatnék-ja
 Pécs.Sub travel-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘to travel to Pécs’

Oblique case-marked input arguments can, and must, be inherited in the case of this HATNÉK_{SED}-noun construction subtype (17d-d''), too. As was mentioned above, however, the resulting constructions are somewhat less acceptable than the corresponding HATNÉK-noun constructions (15c'-g) and HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions with an agentive possessor (16c-c''). If a single oblique case-marked argument is involved (17d), thus, it can more or less readily appear in a *való*-construction while its acceptability in the postnominal complement zone is already questionable. If there is more than one oblique case-marked argument in the input (17d'), even the best, "mixed", strategy (see (15e) and (16c')) provides constructions with questionable acceptability. This subtype of HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions also patterns with HATNÉK-noun constructions in quite readily inheriting an oblique case-marked input verbal modifier (17d''), by hosting it in the prenominal complement zone (see (15g) and (16c'')).

We conclude this subsection with the illustration of a **special** type of HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions (18), mentioned by Oszoli (2014:26). It is special because even its status is difficult to decide: it is a hard methodological question whether this construction type must be described as a part of the standard Hungarian grammar or is to be regarded as a phenomenon that belongs to linguistic performance and not to competence.

Its strangest property is that even **very long sequences** of words can appear left-adjacent to the *hAtmék*-noun with a single stress on the first syllable of the entire sequence—as if this (potentially) huge conglomerate as a whole occupied the (otherwise “narrow”) prenominal complement zone (18b-d); the hyphenated spelling of the Hungarian sentences below expresses the peculiar stress pattern. Further arguments in favor of this construction type occupying the prenominal complement zone are that here (i) accusative case marking appears (here definitely obligatorily) on the counterparts of input objects (18b-d), (ii) oblique case-marked arguments (18c-e’) and adjuncts (18b) appear in a non-attributivized form, (iii) adverbial (18f), converbial (18f’) and postpositional (18c) elements can also appear (in a non-attributivized form). It is an argument against this approach, however, that (certain) operators can appear in the construction in question (18b-e’), which is otherwise not possible in the prenominal complement zone. Moreover, as the variants given in (18e) show, it is definitely preferred for this construction type to contain (certain kinds of) operators; see also (18e’).

- (18) • The **exceptional** cases of inheritance of argument structure in the case of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns
- a. Ilire már megint rájött [...].
 Ili.Sub already again come_over.Past.3Sg
 ‘Ili was overcome by a desire [...].’
 - b. ^(?)...a minden-hírt-kapásból-kommentál-hatnék
 the every-piece_of_news.Acc-promptly-comment-HATNÉK
 ‘... to comment on every pieces of news promptly’
 - c. ^(?)...a mindenkit-mindenkivel-ok-nélkül-össze-veszejt-hetnék
 the everyone.Acc-everyone.Ins-reason-without-together-quarrel-HATNÉK
 ‘...to make everyone have a quarrel with everyone without any reason’
 - d. [?]...a minden-ügyben-csak-a-férje-véleményét-ki-kér-hetnék
 the every-case.Ine-only-the-husband.Poss.3Sg-opinion.Poss.3Sg.Acc-out-ask-HATNÉK
 ‘...to consult in every case only her husband’

- e. ...a ^(?)minden-/^{?)}mindegyik-/***négy**-kollégával-össze-vesz-hetnék
 the every / all / four-colleague.Ins-together-quarrel-HATNÉK
 ‘...to quarrel with every / all / the four colleague(s)’
- e’. ...^{*)}(^{?)}a még-)az-anyjába-is-bele-köt-hetnék
 (the even-)the-mother.Poss.3Sg.Ill-also-into-bind-HATNÉK
 ‘...to pick a quarrel also (/even) with his mother’
- f. ^(?)...az [ingyen-ebédel-hetnék] / [olcsón-söröz-hetnék]
 the free_of_charge-eat_lunch-HATNÉK / cheaply-drink_beer-HATNÉK
 ‘...[to eat lunch free of charge] / [to drink beer cheaply]’
- f’. ^{?)}...a sírva-haza-rohan-hatnék
 the cry.Conv-home-run-HATNÉK
 ‘...to run home crying’

It is also the systematic differences in grammaticality judgments between the variants investigated in (18e-e') above that underlie our hypothesis that the acceptable examples all belong to the group of **HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions** (and not to that of HATNÉK-noun constructions): referring to “institutionalized” events (e.g., quarrelling with colleagues or family members without mentioning specific details peculiar to the given Agent) is significantly preferred to referring to individual complex events.

Furthermore, the same differences—that is, the fact that it is possible to place only certain kinds of utterance chunks in the HATNÉK_{SED}-noun construction subtype in question—may serve as evidence for regarding it as a phenomenon that belongs to the field of linguistic competence; nevertheless, its observationally adequate rule system may be regarded as a syntactic subsystem of a special register of a Hungarian generative grammar. Numerous empirical details as well as several theoretical and methodological questions, however, are left to future research.

1.1.1.2.2.2. Information-structure inheritance

Let us now turn to the question of the inheritance of information-structural functions from arguments of input verbs. As is expected, HATNÉK-nouns (19a-a',c) pattern with ÁS-nouns in being essentially capable of inheriting information structure, in connection with their “on-line created” character. Since, however, HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns are also “on-line created”, they are also correctly predicted to inherit information structure (19b-b',d), sometimes to a somewhat lesser degree (see the construction with a temporal possessor in (19d) below).

All in all, both subtypes of *hAtnék*-nouns can be characterized by the (rather theoretical than practical) inclination to information-structure inheritance, obviously due to their “on-line created” character

→ see the general structure of Hungarian DP

- (19) • The inheritance of **information structure** in the case of HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns
- a. A miniszterelnököt ijedséggel töltötte el
 the prime_minister.Acc fright.Ins fill.Past.DefObj.3Sg away
 [[*mindkét koalíciós partner*] alkotmány-módosít-hatnék-ja].
both coalition partner constitution-modify-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 narrow-scope reading: ?[FRIGHTEN > BOTH_PARTNERS > MODIFY_CONST.]
 ‘It frightened the prime minister that *both coalition partners* had the desire to modify the constitution.’
 wide-scope reading: ✓[BOTH_PARTNERS > FRIGHTEN > MODIFY_CONST.]
 ‘In the case of *both coalition partners*, it frightened the prime minister that they had the desire to modify the constitution.’
- a’. ?Csak [[*mindkét koalíciós partner*] alkotmány-módosít-hatnék-ja]
 only *both coalition partner* constitution-modify-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 tölténé el ijedséggel a miniszterelnököt.
 fill.Cond.DefObj.3Sg away fright.Ins the prime_minister.Acc
 narrow-scope reading:
 ?[ONLY_[BOTH_PARTNERS > MODIFY_CONST.] > FRIGHTEN]
 ‘Only the possibility that *both coalition partners* have the desire to modify the constitution would frighten the prime minister.’
 wide-scope reading: –

- b. A miniszterelnököt ijedséggel tölti el
 the prime_minister.Acc fright.Ins fill.DefObj.3Sg away
 [[*mindkét koalíciós partner*] örökös alkotmány-módosít-hatnék-ja].
both coalition partner eternal constitution-modify-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
narrow-scope reading: [?][FRIGHTEN > BOTH_PARTNERS > MODIFY_CONST.]
 ‘It frightens the prime minister that *both coalition partners* always have a
 desire to modify the constitution.’
 wide-scope reading: [✓][BOTH_PARTNERS > FRIGHTEN > MODIFY_CONST.]
 ‘In the case of *both coalition partners*, it frightens the prime minister that
 they always have a desire to modify the constitution.’
- b'. [?] Csak [[*mindkét koalíciós partner*] örökös alkotmány-módosít-hatnék-ja]
 only *both coalition partner eternal constitution-modify-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg*
 töltené el ijedséggel a miniszterelnököt.
 fill.Cond.DefObj.3Sg away fright.Ins the prime_minister.Acc
 narrow-scope reading:
[?][ONLY_[BOTH_PARTNERS > MODIFY_CONST.] > FRIGHTEN]
 ‘Only the possibility that *both coalition partners* always have a desire to
 modify the constitution would frighten the prime minister.’
 wide-scope reading: –

- c. [?]A miniszterelnököt ijedséggel töltötte el a koalíciós partner minden körzetben való jelölt-állít-hatnék-ja.
 the prime_minister.Acc fright.Ins fill.Past.DefObj.3Sg away the coalition partner every district.Ine be.Part candidate-nominate-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
narrow-scope reading: [?][FRIGHTEN > IN_EACH_DISTRICT > NOMINATE]
 ‘It frightened the prime minister that the coalition partner had the desire to nominate a candidate in each district.’
~~wide-scope reading:~~ *[IN_EACH_DISTRICT > FRIGHTEN > NOMINATE]
 Intended meaning: ‘In the case of every district, it frightened the prime minister that the coalition partner had the desire to nominate a candidate in that particular district.’
- d. ^{??}A miniszterelnököt ijedséggel töltötte el az évtized első minden körzetben való jelölt-állít-hatnék-ja a koalíciós partnere részéről.
 the prime_minister.Acc fright.Ins fill.Past.DefObj.3Sg away the decade first every district.Ine be.Part candidate-nominate-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg the coalition partner.Poss.3Sg part.Poss.3Sg.Del
narrow-scope reading: ^{??}[FRIGHTEN > IN_EACH_DISTRICT > NOMINATE]
 ‘The decade’s first case when the coalition partner had a desire to nominate a candidate in each district frightened the prime minister.’
~~wide-scope reading:~~ *[IN_EACH_DISTRICT > FRIGHTEN > NOMINATE]
 Intended meaning: ‘In the case of every district, the decade’s first case when the coalition partner had a desire to nominate a candidate in that particular district frightened the prime minister.’

As for the details, examples (19a,b) above, in which the possessor serves as a quantifier, are **scopally ambiguous**; and an available narrow-scope reading is to be regarded as evidence for a noun-phrase internal (i.e., “inherited”) information structure. As for examples (19a’,b’,c,d), there is no ambiguity: only the (relevant) narrow-scope reading is available, which verifies information-structure inheritance here, too. Incidentally, the absence of the wide-scope reading can be attributed to two different constraints. In the case of examples (19a’,b’), the embedding (external) focus context makes it impossible for the possessor in the given *hAtnék*-noun construction to simultaneously play the role of an external quantifier. In the case of examples (19c,d), in which an oblique case-marked argument serves as a quantifier, it is presumably due to the “too deeply embedded” position of the given quantifier inside a *való*-construction that the corresponding wide-scope readings are not available.

Note in passing that the exceptional subtype of HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions illustrated in (18) in the previous subsection is also special in respect of information-structure inheritance: they can have only internal information structure, that is, a quantifier inside the construction in question cannot be interpreted externally (20). This constraint may have to do with our assumption that the given quantifier is “deeply embedded” in the typically huge one-stressed expression “enclosed” in the prenominal complement zone.

- (20) ● The inheritance of information structure in the case of the exceptional subtype of HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions
- ⁽²⁾Péterre már megint rájött
 Péter.Sub already again come_over.Past.3Sg
 a *minden-hírt-kapásból-komentál-hatnék*.
 the *every-piece_of_news.Acc-promptly-comment-HATNÉK*
 narrow-scope reading: ^(?)[CAME_OVER > EACH_PIECE_OF_NEWS > COMMENT]
 ‘Péter was overcome by the desire to comment on *every pieces of news*
 promptly.’ ~~wide-scope reading: *[EACH_PIECE_OF_NEWS > CAME_OVER > COMMENT]~~
 Intended meaning: ‘In the case of *every piece of news*, Péter was overcome by the desire comment on it promptly.’

We conclude this subsection with the question of the inheritance of complex information structures (containing two or more operators). The series of examples in (21) below illustrates that both HATNÉK-nouns (21a') and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns (21b') are surprisingly readily capable of inheriting even such information structures (at least theoretically), obviously due to their "on-line created" and eventuality-denoting character and the fact that *hAtnék*-nouns quite readily host fully fledged arguments in their postnominal complement zone as well as in *való*-constructions.

- (21) ● The inheritance of information structure in the case of HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns: complex information structures
- a. Mindkét ügynök csak az igazgatóval tárgyalt.
 both agent only the director.Ins negotiate.Past.3Sg
 [BOTH_AGENTS > ONLY_WITH_THE_DIRECTOR > NEGOTIATE]
 ‘In the case of both agents, it is only WITH THE DIRECTOR that each of them negotiated.’
- a’. ^(?)Na például mindkét ügynöknek a csak az igazgatóval való
 well for_instance both agent.Dat the only thedirector.Ins be.Part
 tárgyal-hatnék-ja, az nagyon sértett minket.
 negotiate-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg that very_much offend.Past.3Sg we.Acc
 [OFFEND > BOTH_AGENTS > ONLY_WITH_THE_DIRECTOR > NEGOTIATE]
 ‘Well for instance, *both agents*’ desire to negotiate only WITH THE DIRECTOR, that offended us very much.’
- b. Minden bevetődő ügynök csak az igazgatóval tárgyal.
 every straggle_in.Part agent only the director.Ins negotiate.3Sg
 [EVERY_AGENT > ONLY_WITH_THE_DIRECTOR > NEGOTIATE]
 ‘In the case of every agent who straggles in, it is only WITH THE DIRECTOR that he negotiates.’
- b’. [?]Na például minden bevetődő ügynöknek a csak az igazgatóval való
 well for_instance every straggle_in.Part agent.Dat the only the director.Ins be.Part
 tárgyal-hatnék-ja, az nagyon sért minket.
 negotiate-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg that very_much offend.3Sg we.Acc
 [OFFEND > EVERY_AGENT > ONLY_WITH_THE_DIRECTOR > NEGOTIATE]
 ‘Well for instance, *the desire of every agent who straggles in to negotiate only WITH THE DIRECTOR*, that offends us very much.’

- c. Az ügynök csak az igazgatóval tárgyalt mindkét termékünkéről.
 the agent only the director.Ins negotiate.Past.3Sg both product.Poss.1Pl.Del
 [ONLY_WITH_THE_DIRECTOR > BOTH_PRODUCTS > NEGOTIATE]
 ‘It is only WITH THE DIRECTOR that the agent negotiated about both products
 of ours.’
- c’.²⁹ Ez volt az évtized leglegyőzhetetlenebb csak az igazgatóval való
 this be.Past.3Sg the decade most_invincible only the director.Ins be.Part
 tárgyal-hatnék-ja mindkét termékünkéről.
 negotiate-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg both product.Poss.1Pl.Del
 [ONLY_WITH_THE_DIRECTOR > BOTH_PRODUCTS > NEGOTIATE] (a set of
 occasions is defined on the basis of this scopal relation)
 ‘This was *the decade’s most invincible desire to negotiate only WITH THE
 DIRECTOR about both products of ours.*’

1.1.1.2.2.3. Basic types of input verbs

This subsection outlines which basic verb types can serve as input to the two types of *hAtnék*-nominalizations. They are worth treating together because there is only a slight difference between them in respect of grammaticality judgments (22a-a'), presumably due to their shared "on-line created" character.

The crucial factor is that an appropriate input argument-structure type must contain an Agent or Agent-like participant, that is, a participant who is capable of actively executing the desired action (that underlies certain *hAtnék*-nouns) or, at least to a certain degree, volitionally controlling some kind of urge (that underlies another semantic subtype of *hAtnék*-nouns).

In the absence of an Agent, thus, verbs without arguments cannot serve as input to *hAtnék*-nominalization. The unergative argument-structure type, however, is definitely one of the ideal inputs, due to the Agent in the subject grammatical function (22b). Nevertheless, even a lower-level or “divided” agentivity suffices. Therefore, reflexive (22c) and reciprocal (22c’) input verbs, in the case of which the subject plays an Agent’s role and a Theme’s role simultaneously, also readily undergo *hAtnék*-nominalization, as well as bodily/sound emission verbs (22c’), in the case of which the subjects’ (limited) agentivity manifests itself in exerting control over his/her urge. Even an *ab ovo* unaccusative verb (22d) may more or less readily undergo *hAtnék*-nominalization, on condition that the speaker attributes more volition(ality) to the subject than normally when the given event simply happens to the subject (NB: the “on-line created” character of both types of *hAtnék*-nouns supports the creation of such actual meanings. Note that in the case of examples (22d,e), there are “extra” grammaticality judgments given, because in these cases the grammaticality judgments do not (completely) coincide with those given uniformly (as a default) in the embedding sentential contexts in (22a,a’) containing the *hAtnék*-nouns in question.

(22) ● Input verb types in the case of HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns

- a. *Ilinek a (tegnapi óra alatt való) folyamatos [...] mindenkit kiborított.*
Ili.Dat the.yesterday.Adj lesson.under.be.Part continuous everyone.Acc make_angry.Past.3Sg
 ‘Ili’s continuous [...] (during the yesterday’s lesson) made everyone angry.’
- a’. [?]*Ez volt az év legidegesítőbb [...].*
this be.Past.3Sg the year most_irritating
 ‘This was the year’s most irritating [...].’
- b. *énekelget-hetnék-je*
sing-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘urge to sing’
- c. *fésülköd-hetnék-je*
com_oneself-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘urge to comb herself’
- c’. *amőbáz-hatnék-ja / vereked-hetnék-je*
playing_tic_tac_toe-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg / fight-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘desire to [play tic-tac-toe] / fight’
- c’’. *ásítóz-hatnék-ja / nevet-hetnék-je / tüsszög-hetnék-je*
gape-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg / laugh-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg / keep_sneezing-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘urge to sing / laugh / sneeze’

- d. ^{(?)??} *el-ájul-hatnék-ja*
away-faint-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘urge to faint’
- e. ^{✓/??} *kikéredzked-hetnék-je* *a WC-re*
ask_for_permission-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg the toilet-Sub
 ‘urge to ask for permission to go to the toilet’
- e’. *WC-re való kikéredzked-hetnék-je*
toilet-Sub be.Part ask_for_permission-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘urge to ask for permission to go to the toilet’
- f. *papírrepülő-dobál-hatnék-ja*
paper_plane-throw-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘desire to throw paper planes’
- f’. *fogat-mos-hatnék-ja*
tooth.Acc-wash-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘urge to wash one’s teeth’

- g. *narancsmag-ki-köpköd-hetnék-je*
orange_pip-out-spit_out-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
'urge to spit out orange pips'
- g'. *mobiltelefon-ki-be-kapcsolgat-hatnék-ja*
mobile_phone-out-into-switch-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
'urge to switch on and off one's mobile phone'
- h. *WC-re me-hetnék-je*
toilet-Sub go-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
'urge to go to the toilet'

Verbs with fully fledged oblique case-marked arguments can also serve as good inputs to both types of *hAtnék*-nominalization. The grammaticality judgments associated with (22e) show that a non-empty postnominal complement zone is much more acceptable in the case of HATNÉK-nouns than in the case of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns, while placing the oblique case-marked argument in a *való*-construction results in fully or almost fully acceptable constructions in the case of both types of *hAtnék*-nouns (22e'). In the case of oblique case-marked arguments which serve as verbal modifiers in the input, the prenominal complement zone of both types of *hAtnék*-nouns readily hosts their output counterparts (22h).

Transitive argument structures can serve as input to *hAtnék*-nominalization only if the input object serves as a verbal modifier (22f,f'). We intend to call the reader's attention to the accusative case marking of the input object: it must be omitted in certain cases (22f) while it must be retained in others (22f').

As is exemplified in (22g-g') above, the double filling of the prenominal complement zone is not prohibited at all, just like in the case of certain SED-noun constructions. All the constructions in question pattern with each other in insisting on the following order of elements in the prenominal complement zone: the input Theme (without any explicit case marking) preceding a (simplex (22g) or complex (22g')) preverb. Note in passing that the exceptional subtype of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns, illustrated in (18) in 1.1.1.2.2.1, also licenses the appearance of huge sequences or words in the prenominal complement zone; (the observations provided in the given subsection suggest that) the emerging rule system of filling this zone, however, obviously follows an entirely different strategy.

1.1.1.2.3. Restrictions on the derivational process

Since every “deviant” input verb class, given in (2), contains a subject which is *per definitionem* not agentive, they are expected to reject *hAtnék*-nominalization. As is illustrated in the series of examples in (23) below, this prediction is entirely borne out. Note that we do not present the fully unacceptable test constructions in each subtype documented in the corresponding subsections.

(23) ● Deviant verbs as inputs to HATNÉK-nouns

A. VAN 'BE' : COPULAR USE

a. *⁹Pétert elfogta a sztár-le-hetnék.

Péter.Acc seize.Past.DefObj.3Sg the star-be-HATNÉK

Intended meaning: 'Péter was seized by *the desire to be a star.*'

B. AUXILIARY VERBS

b. *Pétert elfogta az elmenni fog-hatnék.

Péter.Acc seize.Past.DefObj.3Sg the away.go.Inf will_be-HATNÉK

Intended meaning: 'Péter was seized by *the desire to go away in the future.*'

C. MODAL VERBS

c. *⁹Pétert elfogta a főzni tud-hatnék.

Péter.Acc seize.Past.DefObj.3Sg the cook.Inf can-HATNÉK

Intended meaning: 'Péter was seized by *the desire to be a man who can cook.*'

D. RAISING VERBS

- d. ^{*9}Pétert elfogta a betegnek tűn-hetnék.
 Péter.Acc seize.Past.DefObj.3Sg the ill-Dat seem-HATNÉK
 Int. meaning: 'Péter was seized by *the desire to be a man who seems to be ill.*'

E. PSYCH-VERBS

- e. ^{*9}Ilire már megint rájött a főnök-szeret-hetnék.
 Ili.Sub already again come_over.Past.3Sg the boss-like-HATNÉK
 Intended meaning: 'Ili was overcome by *the urge to like the boss.*'
- e'. ^{?9}Ilit elfogta a főnökért való rajong-hatnék.
 Ili.Acc seize.Past.DefObj.3Sg the boss.Cau be.Part be_keen_on-HATNÉK
 'Ili was seized by *the urge to be keen on the boss.*'
- e". ^{?9}Péterre már megint rájött a tesó-bosszant-hatnék.
 Péter.Sub already again come_over.Past.3Sg the brother-annoy-HATNÉK
 'Péter was overcome by *the urge to annoy his brothers.*'

The grammaticality judgments associated with (23e',e'') suggest that certain types of psych-verbs can serve as inputs to *hAtnék*-nominalization. The degree of agentivity of the input subjects underlies the difference between these cases and the others illustrated in (23): the subject of the verb *rajong* 'be_keen_on' is an unusually active Experiencer (23e'), while the verb *bosszant* 'annoy' definitely has an argument structure version which contains, in addition to the stimulating Theme (e.g., Péter's shouting) and the Experiencer (the brother), an agentive subject (Péter), who volitionally annoys the Experiencer according to the meaning we must associate with the given *hAtnék*-noun construction (23e''). Recall that the argument-structure type in question is exactly the exceptional "4+1^{sb}" psych-verb type.

Note that the not fully unacceptable ('*?') status of the examples in (23a,c,d,e) is due to the fact that, in funny contexts (in which they might be associated with even better grammaticality judgments (cf. Oszoli 2014:25-28)), the speaker can attribute some "extra agentivity" to certain input subjects, presumably due to the "on-line created" character. These are cases in which no agentivity is referred to in the original lexical meaning of the corresponding verb. The speaker exploits his/her world knowledge while hinting on the much work required to acquire starhood (23a) or cooking skills (23c), or the endeavor to make it seem that someone is ill (23d) or loves the boss (23e). The aforementioned question of grammaticality judgments is a serious problem left to future research.

1.1.1.2.4. Nominal and verbal properties

This subsection outlines the verbal (1.1.1.2.4.1) and nominal (1.1.1.2.4.2) properties of the two kinds of *hAtnék*-nouns on the basis of Table 2. We will conclude this topic in a separate subsection (1.1.1.2.4.3) with a short summary of the observations and generalizations.

1.1.1.2.4.1. Verbal properties

- (24) • **Accusative** case-marking in the case of HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns:

I. Idioms

- a. Ilire tegnap rájött *a főnökből való gúny* *^(?)-t) *űz-hetnék.*
 Ili.Sub yesterday come_over.Past.3Sg *the boss.Ela* *be.Part mock(-Acc)* *chase-HATNÉK*
 ‘Yesterday Ili was overcome by *the desire to make a fool of the boss.*’
- a’. Ez volt *az évtized leglegyőzhetlenebb*
 this be.Past.3Sg *the decade* *most_invincible*
főnökből való gúny *^(?)-t) *űz-hetnék-je.*
boss.Ela *be.Part mock(-Acc)* *chase-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg*
 ‘This was *the decade’s most invincible desire to make a fool of the boss.*’
- b. Ilire tegnap rájött *a világ* *^(?)-ot) *lát-hatnék.*
 Ili.Sub yesterday come_over.Past.3Sg *the world(-Acc)* *see-HATNÉK*
 ‘Yesterday Ili was overcome by *the desire to see the world.*’
- b’. Ez volt *az évtized leglegyőzhetlenebb világ* *^(?)-ot) *lát-hatnék-ja.*
 this be.Past.3Sg *the decade* *most_invincible* *world(-Acc)* *see-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg*
 ‘This was *the decade’s most invincible desire to see the world.*’

The other, presumably more important, reason for evaluating *hAtnék*-nouns significantly more verbal than all other types of deverbal nominals is that, in the case of *hAtnék*-nouns, even output counterparts of certain input objects serving as verbal modifiers in non-idiomatic expressions **retain their accusative case marking** (25b-b'). We can establish, as a first approximation, that the retention of accusative case marking depends on phonological properties of the given objects; one-syllable roots, for instance, are more likely to show the property in question than longer roots (see (25c-c'); cf. (25b-b')). Another interesting observation is illustrated in (25d-d') below: if the accusative case marking is retained on the Theme argument of the input verb, the denoted desire is directed towards the speaker's own hair, while the variant without the accusative case marking rather suggests that the given *hAtnék*-noun denoted a desire to wash someone else's hair, which is a realistic interpretation in the case of a hairdresser who happens to be fed up with cutting hair and wants to do something else.

- (25) ● **Accusative** case-marking in the case of HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns:

II. Non-idioms

- a. Ilire rájött *az ebéd előtt való [...].*
 Ili.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg *the lunch before be.Part*
 ‘Ili was overcome by *the desire to [...]* before lunch.’
- a’. Ez volt *az évtized leglegyőzhetlenebb ebéd előtti [...].*
 this be.Past.3Sg *the decade most_invincible lunch befor.Attr*
 ‘This was *the decade’s most invincible desire to [...]* before lunch.’
- b. [fog^{*(?)}-at] mos-hatnék] / [hal^{*(?)}-at] e-hetnék]
tooth(-Acc) wash-HATNÉK / fish(-Acc) eat-HATNÉK
 ‘[wash his teeth] / [eat some fish]’
- b’. [fog^{*(?)}-at] mos-hatnék-ja] / [hal^{*(?)}-at] e-hetnék-je]
tooth(-Acc) wash-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg / fish(-Acc) eat-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘[wash teeth] / [eat fish]’

- c. **[pulóver^(?)(*[?]-t) mos-hatnék] / [édesség^(?)(*[?]-et) e-hetnék]**
pullover(-Acc) wash-HATNÉK / sweets(-Acc) eat-HATNÉK
 ‘[wash pullovers] / [eat sweets]’
- c’. **[pulóver^(?)(*[?]-t) mos-hatnék-ja] / [édesség^(?)(*[?]-et) e-hetnék-je]**
pullover(-Acc) wash-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg / sweets(-Acc) eat-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘[wash pullovers] / [eat sweets]’
- d. **haj[?]([?]-at) mos-hatnék**
hair(-Acc) wash-HATNÉK
 ‘wash hair’
- d’. **haj^{??}([?]-at) mos-hatnék-ja**
hair(-Acc) wash-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘wash hair’

Note in passing that accusative case-marked objects also “retain” their case marking in the case of the exceptional subtype of HATNĚK_{SED}-noun constructions (illustrated in (18b-d) in 1.1.1.2.2.1).

Let us now turn to the next verbal property, namely, the question of adverbial modification. Recall that, in contrast to verbs (and such non-finite verb-like categories as participles, converbs and infinitives), nouns can be characterized by the prohibition against adverbial modification belonging immediately to the noun head. In this respect, both types of *hAtmék*-nouns unambiguously belong to the family of nouns.

In respect of adverbial (26a,a',b,b') and converbial (26a'',b'') modification (as well as postpositional modification (26a,b)), only the output counterparts of such input arguments in the verbal modifier position come into play. As is exemplified below, their appearance in the prenominal complement zone is blocked neither in the HATNÉK-noun type (26a-a'') nor in the HATNÉK_{SED}-noun type (26b-b''). Therefore, both types can be evaluated to be as verbal as *ÁS*-nouns.

(26) ● Potential adverbial and converbial modification of HATNÉK-nouns and

HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns

- a. ⁽²⁾ Iliéket elfogta a nyári szünidő alatt való
 Ili.Add.Acc seize.Past.DefObj.3Sg the summer.Adj holiday under be.Part
külön / együtt / [híd alatt] lak-hatnék.
separately / together / bridge under live-HATNÉK
 ‘Ili and her friends were seized by the desire to live separately / together /
 [under the bridge] during the summer holiday.’
- a’. ⁽²⁾ A gyerekekre rájött az éjjel után való ébren marad-hatnék.
 the child.Pl.Sub come_over.Past.3Sg the midnight after be.Part awake stay-HATNÉK
 ‘The children were overcome by the desire to stay awake after midnight.’
- a’’. ⁽²⁾ A vendégeket elfogta az ok nélkül való
 the guest.Pl.Acc seize.Past.DefObj.3Sg the reason without be.Part
állva marad-hatnék.
stand.Conv remain-HATNÉK
 ‘The guests were seized by the desire to remain standing without reasons.’
- b. [?] Ez volt az évtized leglegyőzhetetlenebb
 this be.Past.3Sg the decade most_invincible
külön / együtt / [híd alatt] lak-hatnék-ja.
separately / together / bridge under live-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘This was the decade’s most invincible desire to live separately / together /
 [under the bridge].’
- b’. [?] Ez volt az évtized leglegyőzhetetlenebb
 this be.Past.3Sg the decade most_invincible
éjjel utáni ébren marad-hatnék-ja.
midnight after.Adj awake stay-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘This was the decade’s most invincible desire to stay awake after midnight.’
- b’’. [?] Ez volt az évtized legindokolatlanabb állva marad-hatnék-ja.
 this be.Past.3Sg the decade most_unjustifiable stand.Conv remain-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg
 ‘This was the decade’s most unjustifiable desire to remain standing.’

Note in passing that adverbial and converbial modification is also possible in the exceptional subtype of HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions (see (18f-f') in 1.1.1.2.2.1), which is in total harmony with our hypothesis that the peculiar properties of this special subtype exactly have to do with the extraordinary expansion of the prenominal complement zone.

The last verbal property in our usual protocol has to do with **information-structure inheritance**. As was established in subsection 1.1.1.2.2.2, both HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns are readily capable of hosting (even quite complex) internal information structures, which, nevertheless, can be regarded rather as a “theoretical possibility” than an actual practice (that is, an attested fact) in language use. The aforementioned readiness to undergo information-structure inheritance is obviously due to their “on-line created” and eventuality-denoting character and the fact that *hAtnék*-nouns quite readily host fully fledged arguments in their postnominal complement zone as well as in *való*-constructions. Thus, HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns are more verbal in respect of information-structure inheritance than the non-event denoting deverbal nominals, namely Ó-nouns and T_{TH}-nouns, and almost reach the verbalness level of ÁS-noun constructions. Nevertheless, for obvious reasons, HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions with a temporal possessor practically cannot host complex information structures.

1.1.1.2.4.2. Nominal properties

Let us start with the question of pluralization, the possibility of which is a nominal property.

HATNÉK-nouns cannot be pluralized, as is illustrated in (27a). The reason is probably the same as in the case of ÁS-nouns: verbs have no plural forms to denote the multiple occurrence of a complex eventuality (Laczkó 2000a:319), and complex-eventuality denoting deverbal nominals pattern with them in this sense, presumably exactly due to the same denotational task, that is, their complex-eventuality denoting function.

- (27) ● Pluralization in the case of HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns
- a. *A gyerekekre rájöttek a lefekvés előtt való
 the child.Pl.Sub come_over.Past.3Pl the go_to_bed.ÁS before be.Part
sír-hatnék-ok / nyafog-hatnék-ok.
cry-HATNÉK-Pl / whine-HATNÉK-Pl
 Intended meaning: ‘Children were overcome by *the* urges to whine before going to bed.’
- b. Ezek voltak az év leglegyőzhetlenebb
 this.Pl be.Past.3Pl the year most_invincible
 ??*sír-hatnék-ja-i* / ??*nyafog-hatnék-ja-i.*
cry-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg-Pl / whine-HATNÉK-Poss.3Sg-Pl
 ‘These were *the* year’s most invincible urges to whine.’

From the point of view that they can have a possessor within the noun phrase they head, HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns are both totally nominal (on possessor selection, see subsection 1.1.1.2.2.1), with no difference in the degree of nominalness between the two groups.

The series of examples in (28) below concerns the phonetic form of the possessedness suffix **-(j)A**. The *-ja* allomorph attaches to *hAtnék*-nouns with (predominantly) back vowels (28a), and, in the case of *hAtnék*-nouns with (predominantly) front vowels, it is also the allomorph containing *-j-* (i.e., *-je*) that is highly preferred (28b). Phonetically similar ordinary words (ending in *-ék*) present an opposite tendency, as is demonstrated in (28c-d): here the *-a/e* allomorphs must be chosen.

- (28) ● Forms of the **possessedness** suffix on *hAtnék*-nouns
- a. **Ásítóz-hatnék-a* / *Ásítóz-hatnék-ja* van.
gape-HATNÉK-Poss.3Pl / *gape-HATNÉK-Poss.3Pl* be.3Sg
 ‘(S)he has the urge to gape.’
- a’. *⁹Tüsszent-hetnék-e* / *⁹Tüsszent-hetnék-je* van.
sneeze-HATNÉK-Poss.3Pl / *sneeze-HATNÉK-Poss.3Pl* be.3Sg
 ‘(S)he has the urge to sneeze.’
- b. *Ez Ili ajándék-a* / **ajándék-ja*.
 this *Ili* *present-Poss.3Pl* / *present-Poss.3Pl*
 ‘This is *Ili*’s present.’
- b’. *Ez a lámpa vezeték-e* / **⁹vezeték-je*.
 this the *lamp* *cable-Poss.3Pl* / *cable-Poss.3Pl*
 ‘This is the cable of the lamp.’

What makes this comparison very interesting from a theoretical point of view is den Dikken's (2015) hypothesis on the independent "morphemic status" of a derivational suffix *-j-* responsible for the expression of *alienable* interpretation between possessor and possessee. The highly preferred status of the *-jA* allomorphs over the *-A* allomorphs among *hAtnék*-nouns may be attributed to the possessor's uniform Agent thematic role, because Agents are claimed (e.g., by Marantz 1984 and Kratzer 1996) to stand in a non-intrinsic (hence, alienable) relation to their predicates (NB: the "possessed" *hAtnék*-noun corresponds to the input verbal predicate in the derivational relationship in question).

1.1.1.2.4.3. Summary

We summarize our observations on verbal (1.1.1.2.4.1) and nominal (1.1.1.2.4.2) properties of HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns in Table 3 below. → see Table*

As can be seen, HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns are basically as verbal as ÁS-nouns, showing some verbal properties to a great, and some to a lesser but significant extent. The quite high degree of verbalness in the case of both types of *hAtnék*-nouns presumably has to do with their “on-line created” status and the related fact that the nouns in question have no (necessarily lexicalized) blocking forms. HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns also pattern with ÁS-nouns in being poorly nominal in every respect except for the three respects in which deverbal nominals typically “score well” (namely, ‘possessive argument’, ‘case marking’ and ‘adjectival modification’). HATNÉK-nouns are even less nominal, since their constructions do not readily host adjectives, so in this respect HATNÉK-nouns pattern with T_{EV}-nouns.

As in our practice applied so far in the corresponding summaries, the presence or absence (or degrees) of verbal and nominal properties are presented by checkmarks, asterisks and question marks in the table. As for the visual representation, recall that the lighter a cell is, the more nominal—and simultaneously the less verbal—the noun type is in the given respect.

Table 3: The degree of **verbalness/nominalness** of hAtnék-nominalizations

PROPERTIES		HATNÉK- NOUN	HATNÉK _{SED} - noun
VERBAL	tense and mood	*	*
	<i>two person/number paradigms of conjugation</i>	*	*
	<i>separability of preverb / verbal modifier</i>	??	*?
	presence / obligatoriness of arguments	(?)	(?)
	accusative case-marked argument	??	?
	adverbial modification	??	??
	<i>information structure (internal scopes)</i>	(?)	?
NOMINAL	pluralization	*	*?
	<i>possessive argument</i>	✓	✓
	<i>case marking</i>	✓	(?)
	adjectival modification	??	✓
	definiteness and other degrees of referentiality	??	??
	quantification (and determination)	*?	*?

Let us highlight the **decisive** details.

We consider it a crucial verbal property that *hAtmék*-nouns obligatorily retain the accusative case marking of certain arguments even if they are not idiom chunks.

Furthermore, both HATNÉK-nouns and HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns essentially inherit the input argument and information structure, obviously due to their “on-line created” and eventuality-denoting character and the fact that they quite readily host fully fledged arguments in the postnominal complement zone as well as in *való*-constructions. They are highly verbal in these crucial respects.

Nevertheless, we must be aware of the fact that the **inheritance** of complex argument and/or information structures can be regarded rather as a “theoretical possibility” than as an actual practice (that is, an attested fact) in language use, especially in the subtype of HATNÉK_{SED}-noun constructions with a temporal possessor. HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns, however, have another subtype, the “exceptional” one illustrated in (18) in 1.1.1.2.2.1, in the case of which practically complete verbal structures are “encapsulated” in the extraordinary expanded prenominal complement zone, preserving such verbal characteristics as accusative case marking and non-attributivized adverbial, converbial, postpositional and oblique case-marked phrases. It is an open methodological question, however, whether this subtype can be taken into consideration at all, and to what degree. It must also be noted at this point that even the mere differentiation of HATNÉK_{SED}-nouns from HATNÉK-nouns is a question that requires much future research, in spite of the careful argumentation on the basis of which we made this distinction in 1.1.1.2.1 in total harmony with the practice ultimately based upon the ÁS-/SED-noun distinction (Laczkó 2000a).

The decisive elements of attributing an essentially poor degree of nominalness to both types of *hAtmék*-nouns (and not only to the complex-eventuality denoting type) are that they cannot be pluralized, they are not compatible with (the regular way of) quantification and they do not readily form non-specific and predicative phrases.

Thanks for your attention