Deep Down, Hungarian is Still OV: Evidence from Radically Truncated Clauses[*]

Tamás Halm[1]
Research Institute for Linguistics (HAS)
Pázmány Péter Catholic University
New Results in the Syntax of Uralic Languages
22 October, 2019, RIL HAS

1 Main claims

- Hungarian has a clause type which is to be analyzed as a minimal VP that lacks vP and all the higher projections in both the inflectional domain (subject and object agreement, tense, aspect, modality) and the higher left periphery of the clause (focusing and negation). I dubbed these phrases 'radically truncated clauses' (RTCs).
- A unique window for observing the fine structure of VP, which is otherwise obscured by obligatory movements even in neutral sentences.
- Hungarian VP turns out to be underlyingly head-final (contrary to previous claims): this means Hungarian is better-behaved typologically than we thought.
- Additional evidence against the universality of head-complement branching order (Kayne 1994).
- Support for the conception of OV as a basic, non-derived word order (Haider 2000).
- Support for the adjunction analysis of both topicalization and quantification (Lasnik and Saito 1992, Fox 1995, Reinhart 1995, Chomsky 1995).
- Support for the split-DP proposal of Sportiche (1998).

2 Hungarian: VO or OV?
- The closest relatives of Hungarian are OV (Khanty and Mansi)
- Proto-Hungarian is claimed to have been OV (É. Kiss 2013)
- Modern Hungarian has many head-final properties: the lexical layer of the

---

NP is head-final, the PP is head-final, the possessor precedes the possessum, participial relatives precede the nominal that they modify, manner adverbs precede the verb, predicative nominals precede the copula, PRTs precede the verb.

- In Modern Hungarian, information structurally neutral sentences are V-initial.
- Is the minimal VP head-initial too? We do not know: the minimal VP is unobservable. (There are some tests but these only tell us about c-command relations and not headedness.)

3 The data

- Radically truncated clauses (RTCs) are used in informal spoken registers (everyday speech) and informal written registers (such as blogs or discussion forums). All the data below come from a database containing 3032 utterances collected from the internet and the Hungarian National Corpus. All the grammaticality judgements reported were also tested by way of a web-based survey (680 resondents).[2]
- Typically used to describe a succession of sub-events (or a single subevent) within a well-defined containing event or situation:

(1) *[Namármost amikor én alud-t-am   ott,   úgy   kezd-t-em,   hogy]*
   well   when I slept-PST-1SG there so   start-PST-1SG that
   'So when I was sleeping there, the way I started was
   szemét   le-visz, szoba rendbe-rak, fürdőszoba el-pakol...
   rubbish PRT[3]-carry room PRT-put   bathroom   PRT-pack
   I took out the rubbish, I cleared the room, I cleared the bathroom.'

- Not a syntax-free to-do-list. To-do-lists in Hungarian typically involve an infinitival construction with relatively free word order, with objects obligatorily carrying accusative case and (optionally) having the definite article:

(2)   a.   *(a) szemet-et   le-vin-ni*
             the rubbish-ACC   PRT-carry-INF
    b.   *le-vin-ni   a   szemet-et*
             PRT-carry-INF the rubbish-ACC
             'to take out the rubbish'

---

2 For the results and discussion, see paper at www.tamashalm.com.

3 Verb modifiers express the result state or location of the theme argument. There are two kinds of verb modifiers: verbal particles (such as *le* 'down' above), and bare adjectival phrases or noun phrases (such as *rendbe* 'into order' above.) For convenience, I will use the term verbal particles and the gloss PRT, but all the claims and statements in the paper are valid for the broader family of verb modifiers as well. For details, see Appendix.

- RTCs are subject to strict constraints. They lack all phi-feature agreement (subject agreement as well as object agreement) and they also lack all tense, aspect and mood features. RTCs also lack infinitival suffixation:

(3) a. *sör   meg-isz*
         beer PRT-drink
         'I/you/she/he/we/you-pl/they drink/drank the/a beer.'

     b. **sör   meg-isz-ik*
         beer PRT-drink-3SG.INDEF
         'She/he drinks a/some beer.'

     c. **sör   meg-isz-sza*
         beer PRT-drink-3SG.DEF
         'She/he drinks the beer.'

     d. **sör   meg-in-ni*
         beer PRT-drink-INF
         'to drink the/a beer.'

- In RTCs, the object is obligatorily in the morphologically unmarked case form (otherwise reserved for nominative subjects and possessors), which is highly unusual since objects in Hungarian obligatorily carry accusative case:

(4) a. **sör-t   meg-isz*
         beer-ACC PRT-drink

     b. *sör   meg-isz*
         beer PRT-drink
         'I/you/she/etc. drink/drank the/a beer.

- The word order in neutral full sentences in Hungarian is V-initial:

(5) *Be-kapcsol-t-a   János   a   tévé-t.*
     PRT-switch-PAST-3SG.DEF   John   the   television-ACC
     'John switched on the television.'

- As opposed to this, in RTCs, the word order is strictly O PRT V:

(6) a. **be-kapcsol   tévé,   *ki-nyit   sör*
         PRT-switch   television   PRT-open beer

     b. *tévé   be-kapcsol,   sör   ki-nyit*
         television PRT-switch   beer PRT-open
         'I/you/she/etc. switch(ed) on the/a TV and open(ed) the/a beer.'

- In RTCs, unlike in to-do-lists (see (2) above), the object cannot have a

definite article:

(7)   *(*a) kád   ki-mos,   (*a) padló   fel-mos*
               the   bathtub PRT-wash   the   floor   PRT-wash
               '(I/you/she/he/we/you-pl/they) clean(ed) the tub and mop(ped) the floor.'

- Importantly, the object is a nominal phrase (not a mere N), it can be an AdjP, a NumP, a PossP, a QP or even a CP:

(8)   *az üvegajtón   lévő   és   eddig   nem használt sötétítőfüggöny*
          the glassdoor.on being and so.far not   used   shading.curtain
          be-húz
          PRT-draw
          'I/you/etc. draw/drew the shading curtain which is on the glass door and has not been used so far.'

(9)   *két sör meg-isz*
          two beer[4] PRT-drink
          '(I/you/she/he/we/you-pl/they) drink/drank two biers.'

(10)   *hajam   meg-szárít*
         hair-POSS.1SG PRT-dry
         '(I/you/she/he/we/you-pl/they) dry/dried my hair.'

(11)   *minden polc   le-töröl*
        every   shelf   PRT-wipe
        'I/you/she/etc. throw/threw wipe(d) off every shelf.'

- The object can be in the plural:

(12)   *ablak-ok   be-csuk*
        window-PL   PRT-close
        'I/you/she/etc. closed/closed the windows.'

- In RTCs, no subject is allowed in transitive or unergative sentences (13), however, the subject is allowed in unaccusatives (14):

(13) a.   *(*én) tévé   be-kapcsol*
          I   television PRT-switch
          'I switch(ed) on the television.'
     b.   *(*én) fut*
          I   run
          'I run/ran.'

---

4 In Hungarian, nouns premodified by a numeral appear in the singular.

(14)   *én át-öltöz*[5]
   I PRT-dress
   'I change(d). (meaning: I change(d) my clothes).'

- Also, reflexive pronouns are not acceptable as RTC objects:

(15) a. *kez-em meg-mos*
    hand-1SG PRT-wash
    'I/you/he/she/it/etc. wash(ed) my hands.'
  b. **magam meg-mos*
    myself PRT-wash
    'I wash(ed) myself.'

- Importantly, RTCs are not cases of incorporation (true or pseudo) (Mithun 1984, Massam 2001, Farkas and De Swart 2003, Borik and Gehrke 2015). The objects of RTCs can be arbitrarily complex: heavily modified NPs (8), QPs (10), NumPs (9,12), DPs (35) or even CPs (34). Verb-adjacency is not required: the object can be topicalized, heavy-right-shift is possible, and indirect objects typically intervene between the object and the verb (see Section 6.4 and Appendix). The objects are not number-neutral (9,12). There is no requirement of name-worthiness or conceptual unity:

(16)   *borotvahab elő-vesz*
   shaving.foam PRT-take
   'I/you/she/etc. take/took out the shaving foam.'

- Known cases of incorporation in Hungarian (Farkas and De Swart 2003) are very different from RTCs. First, incorporated objects are obligatorily accusative-marked:

(17) a. *Újságot   olvas-t-ak a lány-ok.*
    newspaper-ACC read-PAST-3PL the girl-PL
  b. **Újság olvas-t-ak a lány-ok.*
    newspaper read-PAST-3PL the girl-PL
    'The girls read a/some newspapers. (The girls were engaged in newspaper-reading.)

- Also, incorporated objects and PRTs are in complementary distribution.

---

5 The unaccusative status of *átöltöz* 'lit. over-dress, meaning: change clothes' is evidenced by the following: 1) the presence of a verbal particle, 2) the fact that *átöltöz* can appear in an adjectival participle expressing anteriority (*az át-öltöz-ött fiú* the PRT-dress-PART boy 'the boy who changed clothes' and 3) the fact that it can appear in predicative adverbial participle phrases (*a fiú át van öltöz-ve* the boy PRT be.3SG dress-PART 'the boy has changed clothes (lit. the boy is in a state of having changed clothes)'. (Cf. É. Kiss 2002, 223-229)

(18) a. *Újságot   olvas-t-ak   a   lány-ok.*
        newspaper-ACC read-PAST-3PL the   girl-PL
    b. **Újságot   el-olvas-t-ak   a   lány-ok.*
        newspaper-ACC PRT-read-PAST-3PL the   girl-PL
        'The girls read a/some newspapers. (The girls were engaged in
        newspaper-reading.)'

- This is in stark contrast with RTCs, where the objects cannot have
  accusative case marking and PRTs are typical.

4 A note on pragmatics

- Productive construction, but restricted pragmatically to describing a
  subevent (or succession of subevents) within a well-defined containing
  event/situation (either contextually given or spelled out explicitly)
- Since an RTC is underspecified in terms of tense, mood, phi-features etc.,
  these are inferred from the hearer from contextual knowledge
- Out of the blue, RTCs are infelicitous:

(19) a. *#Képzeld,   szemét   le-visz,   szoba   el-pakol.*
        imagine:IMP:2SG rubbish-NOM   PRT-carry room-NOM   PRT-pack
        'Imagine, I/you/she/etc. take/took out the rubbish, clear(ed) the
        room.'
    b. *Képzeld,   a   szemet-et   le-vit-té-k,*
        imagine:IMP:2SG the   rubbish-ACC   PRT-carry-PAST-2PL
        a   szobá-t   el-pakol-tá-k.
        the   room-ACC   PRT-pack-PAST-2PL
        'Imagine, they took out the rubbish, they cleared the room.'

- RTCs are overwhelmingly telic (in my corpus, 2889 RTCs out of 3032 are
  telic, ~95%): since RTCs typically describe a quick succession of non-
  overlapping subevents, it is natural that atelic predicates are generally
  infelicitous, since by their unboundedness, they would violate the condition
  on non-overlapping.
- They contain either inherently telic verbs (which are all derived via the
  denominal/deadjectival verbalizer *-ít*), or have a telicizing PRT:

(20) a. *könyv   el-olvas*
        book-NOM   PRT-read
        'I/you/etc. read the book. (the entire book, telic)'
    b. *#könyv   olvas*
        book-NOM   read
        '*I/you/etc. read the book (not necessarily the entire book, atelic)'

c. *lazackocka   pirít*
    salmon.cube-NOM   fry
    'I/you/etc. fry/fried the salmon cubes.'

- RTCs are unspecified for illocutionary force: they can be interpreted as declarative (see above) or imperative[6]:

(21) *Pofa be-fog!*
      jaw   PRT-keep
      'Shut up! (lit. Keep your jaw closed!)'

5 Background: the VP in Hungarian

- I assume the following structure for vP and the inflectional domain (cf. Bartos 1999, den Dikken 1999, É. Kiss 2002 etc.):

(22)   [$_{AgrSP}$ [$_{AgrOP}$ [$_{MoodP}$ [$_{TenseP}$ [$_{ModP}$ [$_{vP}$ external arg. [$_{VP}$ internal arg. [$_{V'}$ V PRT]]]]]]]]]

- The heads are joined to V via an operation called morphosyntactic merge, and the surface order of the suffixes is the mirror image of the morphosyntactic order (Bartos 1999, Baker 1985).
- I assume that PRT is phrasal and a base-generated complement of V (É. Kiss 2006), but nothing hinges on this particular choice, see Appendix.
- For the higher functional projections, I follow É. Kiss (2006) (see also Marácz 1989, Brody 1995, Olsvay 2006, Puskás 2000, Surányi 2003,2006b for different proposals):

(23)   [$_{NegP}$ [$_{FocP}$ [$_{NegP}$ [$_{PredP}$ [$_{vP}$ [$_{VP}$ ..]]]]]]]

- I further assume that even in neutral sentences, the verb obligatorily moves to Pred^0 (or Asp^0 or T^0) and the verbal particle moves to Spec,PredP (or Spec,AspP or Spec,TP) (É. Kiss 2006, see also Koopman and Szabolcsi 2000, Olsvay 2002, Csirmaz 2006 and Surányi 2009a).The word order of the postverbal elements is free.

(24)   [$_{PredP}$ meg [$_{Pred'}$ ette [$_{vP}$ Péter [$_{v'}$ ~~ette~~ [$_{VP}$ a levest [$_{V'}$ ~~ette meg~~]]]]]]
          Meg-ette   Péter   a   leves-t.
          PRT-eat:PAST:3SG Peter   the soup-ACC
          Meg-ette   a   leves-t   Péter.

---

6 Since in Hungarian, interrogatives generally only differ in intonation from declaratives, the fact that RTCs can be used in interrogatives as well is trivial.

PRT-eat:PAST:3SG the soup-ACC Peter
'Peter ate the soup.'

- The internal structure of the Hungarian VP (vP) has been long debated (Marácz 1989, Brody 1995, É. Kiss 2002, Bene 2005, Surányi 2006). While the different behaviour of unergative and unaccusative verbs and anaphora facts seem to support a hierarchical VP, other observations concerning binding principle C violations, weak crossover and the free post-verbal word order point to a flat VP.
- É. Kiss (2008) proposed a unified account, which assumes that as the verb moves to Pred^0, the vP is flattened: that is, at one stage of the derivation, the vP is hierarchical, but in later stages, it is flat. As a result, the word order associated with the hierarchical vP is unobservable, since the vP always flattens.

6 The core analysis

- RTCs exhibit the intact Hungarian VP, before V-movement.
- RTCs are pure VPs, lacking every functional projection above VP (with the possible partial exception of NegP).
- This explains the lack of phi-feature agreement, tense (or infinitive marking), mood, modality and higher functional projections (such as focus).
- Lack of accusative case marking and the fact that external arguments (the subjects of transitives and unergatives) cannot be realized is due to the lack of a vP layer. (Bowers 1993, Chomsky 1995, Kratzer 1996).
- Because of the lack of accusative case assignment, the object emerges in the nominative (with no overt case marking). Cf. nominative as an 'unmarked case' (Marantz 1992), 'caseless' (Bittner and Hale 1996), the 'default case' (Schütze 2001) or 'no case at all' (Kornfilt and Preminger 2015). Unacceptability of reflexive pronoun objects is also due to lack of syntactically realized external argument.[7]
- Strict word order is further evidence that the VP (prior to V moving out) is hierarchical underlyingly. However, in contrast to earlier proposals, the word order of this minimal VP is strictly head-final: O PRT V:

(25)   *sör   meg isz*
         [$_{VP}$ internal arg. [$_{V'}$ PRT V]]
         beer   PRT drink
         'I/you/etc. drink/drank the beer.'

---

7 Note also the optional drop of the verbalizing suffix with certain verbs (in 174 out of 334 cases): *tévé ki-kapcs(-ol)* television PRT-switch$_N$-VRB 'switch off TV', *kocsi le-park-%(ol)* car PRT-park$_N$-VRB 'park car', *ajándék be-csomag-*(ol)* present PRT-pack$_N$-VRB 'wrap present'. Variation due to differences in transparency of suffixation, [N+VRB] vs. [V].

- The internal argument is generated in SpecVP ; PRT is a complement to the left of V.
- The alternative would be to assume a [$_{VP}$ O [$_{V'}$ V PRT]] structure and derive the O PRT V surface order of RTCs by stipulating a set of movements (either the movement of the elements of VP out of VP or the remnant movement of VP itself).[8] However, in RTCs, the lack of structure above VP means that there are no structural positions that these hypothetical movements could target.
- While the object may be topicalized, there is evidence that PRT and V never leave the VP. Thus, RTCs in Hungarian provide prima facie evidence against the assumption that all complements are to the right of the respective head (Kayne 1994).
- There is also independent evidence that topicalization is non-obligatory in RTCs.
- For a discussion of how this analysis can be transposed into other proposals for the syntax of verbal particles, see Appendix.
- Terminological note: 'truncation' in Haegeman (2003) technical sense: missing layers were never built up in the first place.
- RTCs arise in cases where the derivation of a clause is stopped prematurely, at the VP level.
- Motivation: maximize the efficiency of information exchange: whatever can be reconstructed from the context does not need to be uttered/encoded.
- Price to be paid: VPs are not phases, in most RTCs, one argument of a two-argument predicate is unrealized. Uttering RTCs involves flouting of basic rules of spellout.
- RTCs are properly built, informative, but also somewhat illegal. This is reflected in acceptability: RTCs are perceived as acceptable but degraded (average 4.2 on 1-to-7 Likert scale), as compared to grammatical non-RTCs (6.8) and ungrammatical non-RTCs (1.2).[9]

7 Operations targeting RTCs

- Over 75% of RTCs in my database exhibit the pure O PRT V sequence.
- The rest are (X) O (X) PRT V. I claim these are the result of topicalization (via adjunction) or adjunction of free adjuncts or adverbials.
- O > PRT > V is never violated.

---

8 Cf. e.g. Zwart (1993, 1997) and Koster (1994) for the former and Hinterhölzl (1997) and Haegeman (2000) for the latter.

9 The test was filled out by 680 respondents. 546 of them (80%) were 'RTC-accepters' (average RTC acceptability score>=2) and 134 (20%) were 'RTC-rejecters' (average RTC acceptability score<2). The figures above reflect the 'RTC-accepter' population (the 80%). For a discussion of this, other methodological issues and other results of the test, see paper at www.tamashalm.com.

7.1 Topicalization as adjunction: possible but not obligatory

- Topicalization is a flexible operation in Hungarian: topics can be left-adjoined to PredP, FocP and NegP (cf. É. Kiss 2002), so there is no principled reason why topics could not be adjoined to a pure VP.
- Most manner adverbs such as *óvatosan* 'carefully' can be left-adjoined to PredP or VP but crucially not to a topic (standard test of the topic-predicate boundary, cf. É. Kiss 2002). Interestingly, *óvatosan* 'carefully' is attested in two possible positions:

(26) a. [VP *óvatosan* [VP*ajtó be-csuk*]]
         carefully   door   PRT-close
         'I/you/she/etc. close/closed the door carefully.'

   b. [VP*ajtó* [VP *óvatosan* [VP*ajtó be-csuk*]]]
         door   carefully door PRT-close
         'The door, I/you/she/etc. close/closed carefully.'

- O must be in situ in VP in (26a), and it has been topicalized in (26b). That is, RTCs are minimally VPs, but the topicalization of the object is possible. Since topics are always left-adjoined and topicalization does not induce verb movement, the topicalization of O leaves the O PRT V order intact.
- The availability of topicalization accounts for O X PRT V sentences such as:

(27) [VP *telefon* [VP*ebben a pillanatban* [VP*telefon le-tesz*]]]
        phone   this.in the moment.in phone PRT-put
      'I/you/etc. put the phone down in this very moment.'

- For the adjunction analysis of adverbials in the Hungarian sentence, see É. Kiss 2010a). The object can also remain in situ, resulting in X O PRT V:

(28) [VP*egy ablakkal arrébb* [VP*csekk befizet*]]
         one window.with further   bill PRT-pay
      'I/you/etc. pay/paid the bill at the next window.'

- Additional evidence for non-obligatoriness of topicalizaton: availability of strongly non-referential idiomatic objects:

(29) a. *János ki-ver-te a balhé-t.*   (38 in HNC)
        John   PRT-beat-PST:3SG:DEF the trouble-ACC

   b. **A balhét ki-ver-te János.*   (0 in HNC)
        the trouble-ACC   PRT-beat-PST:3SG:DEF John

c. *balhé   ki-ver*   (attested +
   trouble PRT-beat   acceptable)
   'I/you/he/she/etc. protest(ed) very strongly.'
   Idiomatic meaning: 'John protested very strongly.'
   Literal meaning (nonsensical): 'John beat out the trouble.'

- Note also: in full counterparts of RTCs, in-situ object often sounds more natural, cf. (1).

7.2 Focussing: not possible

- Identificational focus construction[10] is characterized by the inversion of the PRT and V and a special intonation contour (focused element receives heavy stress and all following elements are obligatorily destressed):

(30)   *JÁNOS hívta   meg   Marit.*
        John   invite-PAST.3SG   PRT   Mary-ACC
        'It was John who invited Mary.'

- PRT-V inversion is only obligatory in tensed clauses. In tenseless clauses (such as infinitives or participles), it is optional (cf. Brody 1995).
- In RTCs, both O and PRT V are obligatorily stressed (PRT V forms a single phonological word), which rules out focus (since after a focused O, PRT V would be destressed):

(31) a. *'ajtó 'be-csuk*
        door PRT-close
        'I/you/etc. close/closed the door.'
     b. **AJTÓ be-csuk*
        door   PRT-close
        'Intended: It is the door that I/you/etc. close/closed.'

7.3 Negation: marginally available?

- Negation is only very marginally attested in RTCs (22 cases out of altogether 3032, <1%). All attestations are O Neg PRT V:

(32) a. *telefon   nem fel-vesz*
        phone   not   PRT-pick
        'I/you/etc. do/did not pick up the phone.'

---

10 See Horvath 1986, Szabolcsi 1981, Kenesei 1986, Brody 1995, É. Kiss 1998, Horváth 2004, É. Kiss 2010b among others.

- Similarly to focussing (see above), negation obligatorily triggers PRT V inversion in finite clauses but not in infinite clauses. So the lack of inversion in RTCs is not surprising.
- Why is Neg O PRT V order unattested? Note that in clausal negation in non-RTCs in Hungarian, Neg and V typically form a single phonological word (Neg+V in simple negation, Neg+Foc+V if a focused element intervenes, and Neg+PRT+V in non-finite clauses without PRT V inversion). (Cf. Kenesei 1994 on the adjacency requirement concerning Foc and V.)
- In non-RTCs, this adjacency of Neg and V comes about as a result various movement operations, some triggered by negation (cf. Szendrői 1998, Olsvay 1998, Puskás 2000, Olsvay 2000, 2006, Surányi 2002, É. Kiss 2002, 2008, 2009) In RTCs, no such movements are possible. As a result, the phonological requirement of linear adjacency can only be satisfied at PF by linearizing Neg immediately to the left of PRT+V. (For other phonologically motivated operations at PF in Hungarian, cf. the D-deletion rule proposed by Szabolcsi (1992) or the linearization of the elements in the postverbal field according to their phonological weight proposed by É. Kiss (2008).)
- Alternative motivation: topicalization in order to remove the pre-verbal object (which is underspecified in terms of definiteness/specificity) from the scope of negation in order to ensure a specific interpretation. (In non-RTCs, this comes about for free.) (In all 22 sentences, the object is definite/specific but this is morphologically not marked in RTCs.) Note parallel with participial relatives.
- If focusing is completely out, why is negation marginally possible? Tentative answer: while negation is only Merge, focusing is Merge and Move.

7.4 O PRT V X

- Some rare instances of material to the right of V are attested (70 cases out of 2793, ~2%).
- Either right-adjunction of free adjuncts and adverbials (something which Hungarian generally allows, see É. Kiss 2010), or heavy CP shift:

(33)   [VP[VP*gyógyszer   ki-vált*]   [PP*teljes   ár-on*]]
              medicine PRT-redeem   complete price.on
              'I/you/etc. buy/bought the medicine at full price.'

(34)   [VP*kávézóban* [VP [CP ~~merre   vannak   a   koalák~~] *meg-kérdez*][CP*merre*
              café.in   where   are   the   coalas PRT-ask   where

vannak a   koalák]
are   the   coalas
'I/you/etc. ask/asked in the café where the coalas are.'

8 Implications for Hungarian and cross-linguistically

- Several known surface phenomena in Hungarian which are typical of SOV languages: the lexical layer of the NP is head-final, the PP is head-final, the possessor precedes the possessum, participial relatives precede the nominal that they modify, manner adverbs precede the verb, predicative nominals precede the copula, PRTs precede the verb (cf. É. Kiss 2013).
- Since Hungarian is generally assumed to be VO, it is assumed that these are either fossils from an earlier head-final stage in the history of Hungarian or they can be derived without assuming a head-final underlying structure. The fact that the Hungarian VP turned out to be head-final may make some of these phenomena worth revisiting.[11]
- More generally, RTCs in Hungarian provide prima facie evidence against the universality of head-complement branching order (Kayne 1994), and strong support to the conception of OV as a basic, non-derived word order (Haider 2000).
- While the focus position is absolutely unavailable in RTCs, topicalization can happen freely. This is in line with the analysis of topicalization as adjunction (Lasnik and Saito 1992, see also the studies in É. Kiss 1995): while in RTCs, the functional projections above VP such as TenseP, FocP etc. are missing (with the possible exception of NegP), topicalization via adjunction is possible.
- The fact that QPs are attested in RTCs (11) favours the analysis of Quantifier Raising as adjunction (Fox 1995, Reinhart 1995, Chomsky 1995, É. Kiss 2010a): the alternative analysis of QR in terms of movement to the specifiers of designated functional projections (Beghelli and Stowell 1997, Szabolcsi 1997) would require that such functional projections (DistP, RefP) be available in RTCs. However, as we have seen, RTCs typically lack functional projections above VP.
- The unavailability of definite articles in RTC may be interpreted as supporting evidence for the split-DP hypothesis (Sportiche 2005).
- RTCs may prove useful in the exploration of the fine structure of VP in other languages as well. RTCs are most easily identifiable in languages with rich inflectional morphology, an articulated left periphery, overt accusative

---

11 The languages most closely related to Hungarian, Khanty and Mansi, are SOV. É. Kiss (2003) has argued that Proto-Hungarian was also SOV. I claim that Modern Hungarian, too, is in essence SOV, even if this quality is masked in non-truncated clauses due to the obligatory movement of V out of vP.

case marking (and overt definite articles).

Appendix 1   Lack of definite article

- Objects of RTCs cannot have a definite article, even in cases where a contextually salient, unique entity is being referred to (6).
- Proper names (standardly analyzed as DPs) are admitted:

(35)   *anya   fel-öltöz,   Malacka   le-vetkőz*
mother PRT-dress Piglet   PRT-undress
'Mother gets/got dressed, Piglet undresses/undressed.'

- PossPs, which are obligatorily definite in Hungarian (e.g. they obligatorily trigger definite agreement within the DOM system of Hungarian) are also admitted in RTCs (10).
- Objects of RTCs are often topicalized (6.1) which suggests that they can be interpreted as definites even if they lack a definite article.
- Lack of AgrOP (the projection responsible for object agreement on the verb) does not explain the unavailability of the definite article, as infinitives also lack AgrOP but can readily have an object with a definite article:

(36)   *a   gázszerelő-t   fel-hív-ni*
the   gas.fitter-ACC PRT-call-INF
'call the gas fitter (as an element on a to-do-list, literally: 'to call the gas fitter')

- Pragmatic constraint? The defective clause lacks any frame of reference of its own, so definiteness is not specified within the defective clause itself but it is inferred later on from the context (much as tense, person, number etc. are inferred from the context).
- The low availability of definite articles in RTCs (22 out of 3032, <1%) suggests that the constraint may be syntactic.
- Silent DP layer? Possible analysis (following Weir 2017's analysis of optional article drop affecting subjects and objects in English reduced written register): phonologically null determiner with choice-function semantics underspecified for definiteness:

(37) $\emptyset_D$ *hűtő   ki-nyit*
D   fridge PRT-open
'I/you/he/she/etc. open the fridge'

- Problems: Why only in reduced registers? Why only in arguments? Why obligatory in RTCs but optional in English reduced register? Why are demonstratives also unacceptable?
- No DP layer? Sportiche (2005) split-DP proposal: V selects for NP arguments, D layer added later on, outside VP:

(38) a.   …   D   …   [NP V …]
      b.   …   [D NP] …   [~~NP~~ V …]

- Since RTCs are minimal VPs, lack of D falls out automatically. Lack of demonstratives

is also explained (these are normally in Spec,DP).

- On balance, split-DP approach appears more plausible.
- For details on the structure of the extended NP, see Appendix.

Appendix 2   Similar constructions in other languages

- 'Inflektiv' in German (Teuber 1998, Schlobinski 2001, Bücking and Rau 2013, Gärtner 2017) exhibits a lack of inflection, strict O PRT V order (which is not surprising for German) and a lack of overt subject:

(39)   *meinen   satz   direkt   wieder streich* (B & R 2013, 72)
          my-ACC sentence directly   again delete
          'I am deleting my sentence again on purpose.'

- Differences:
  - Only in web-based electronic written communication and comics.
  - Silent subject can only be interpreted as 1SG/1PL, the tense as the immediate present, and the illocutionary force is taken to be performative.
  - Object can have a definite article and it carries accusative case.
  - Subject drop happens indiscriminately: subjects of unaccusatives are compulsorily dropped too.
  - Tentatively, obligatory accusative case assignment suggests that the Inflektiv appears to have a vP layer plus a general subject-drop rule.
- Truncated subordinated clauses bigger than VPs, e.g. adverbial clauses (Haegeman 2003, 2010):

(40) a.   Main clauses: (Sub) Top* Focus   Force   Fin   IP
      b.   Adverbial clauses: Sub   Fin   IP

- Chechetto (to appear): 'internal argument drop' sentences in Romance: root clauses that are specified for force yet lack a vP layer.
- Root infinitives or optional infinitives in child language studies (Rizzi 1993, Wexler 1998, Guasti and Rizzi 2002 a.o.): truncated matrix clauses which lack either agreement or tense (or indeed both) and where the verb emerges in either infinitival or bare form.
- Clause chains (cf. Wiesser 2015): a succession of clauses where all but the last one lack finiteness marking (tense or mood). However, subject and object agreement is present, external arguments are not excluded, accusative case is being asssigned.
- Reduced written register (Haegeman 1987, Massam & Roberge 1989, Massam 1992 a.o.): full sentences with optional subject (and object) drop, subject is syntactically active.

Appendix 3   RTCs and the theories of verbal modification in Hungarian

- The syntactic status, base-generated position, and movement options of PRTs in Hungarian have been the subject of considerable discussion in the literature (for recent overviews, see Hegedűs 2013 and Hegedűs to appear).
- For ease of exposition, I have assumed É. Kiss (2006):
  - PRTs are base-generated as phrasal complements of V^0 (they are AdvPs which consist of a single head in the case of verbal particles),

15

- they move in neutral sentences to Spec,PredP (and the verb is moved to Pred[0]).
- My analysis carries over seamlessly to all those proposals which assume that PRT is base-generated as a phrasal complement of V[0], and that it is moved in neutral sentences to the specifier of a functional projection (PredP/AspP/TP depending on the proposal) which subsumes VP (followed by a movement of V into the head position of said projection). (Piñón (1995), É. Kiss (2002), Alberti (2004), Den Dikken (2004), Csirmaz (2004), Csirmaz (2006) and Surányi (2009a).
- Some authors assume that PRT and V form a complex head (Horvath 1986, Brody 1990, É. Kiss 1999b, Szendrői 2003, Olsvay 2004. Crucially for our purposes, however, many of these authors (Brody 1990, É. Kiss 1999, Olsvay 2004) also assume that in neutral sentences, PRT is moved to a higher position outside of vP. This means that the gist of our proposal can be straightforwardly implemented in these frameworks as well.
- In the lexicalist approach (Ackerman 1984, Ackerman 1987, Ackerman and Webelhuth 1998), no movement of PRT is assumed in neutral sentences, and it is assumed that [PRT+V] is inserted into syntax as complex lexical unit, which means that the O PRT V word order in RTCs falls out trivially. (Note, however, that the lexicalist approach as a whole is problematic, see e.g. Hegedűs 2003, 18-21 for a discussion.)
- Uniquely among the non-lexicalist models, Horvath (1986) and Szendrői (2003) assume no PRT or V movement in neutral sentences. Also, both authors assume that the PRT is base generated to the left of V. Adding the trivial assumption that direct objects are in a specifier position, these models would also predict the O PRT V word order observed in RTCs. Note, however, that the assumption of a non-phrasal PRT has been convincingly argued to be problematic for independent reasons by various authors (see e.g. É. Kiss (2006, 44-47), Surányi (2009a, 209-212), and also that the near-consensus in the literature is that PRT and V *are* moved even in neutral sentences (see discussion above).
- Surányi (2009a) claims that in neutral sentences, a phrasal PRT moves to Spec,TP through an intermediate landing position below vP and above VP, which he identifies as Spec,PredP projection.[12] While I wish to remain agnostic as to whether this position exist to general, it can be safely claimed that is not projected in RTCs. If it were, then the obligatory movement of PRT to Spec,PredP and of V to Pred[0] would produce a PRT V O surface word order, which is completely unattested with RTCs.
- Hegedűs (2013) argues that, in line with their predicative nature, PRTs are subsumed under a small clause complement of V, together with the internal argument: [vP [v' V [sc … int.arg… PRT …] (see also Hegedűs and Dékány 2017). In Hegedűs (to appear), the SC is instantiated as pP with where the internal argument is base-generated in Spec,pP and the PRT is merged under p: [vP [v' V [pP internal arg. [p' p PathP]]]]. PathP is taken to house regular directional PPs, which may cooccur with a PRT (in what has been dubbed 'locative doubling', cf. Surányi 2009b) but may also occur on their own. The word order of RTCs falls out from this structure as well, if one assumes that the pP complement is to the left of V:

(41)   *sör*   *meg*   *isz*
    [vP [v' [pP internal arg. [p' p   PathP]] V]]
            beer   PRT   drink
    'I/you/etc. drink/drank the beer.'

- RTCs where a PRT and a directional or locative adverbial cooccur have an O PP PRT V

---

12 Note that this is different from É. Kiss's (2006) proposal, where PredP is situated above vP and where Spec,PredP is the final landing slot for PRT in neutral sentences.

word order, which indicates that the pP itself is head-final (in line with FOFC,
Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts 2014):

(42)   *kulcs*   *zár-ba*   *be*   *tesz*
    [VP [V' [pP internal arg. [P' PathP   p]]   V]]
    key   lock-into   PRT   put
    'I/you/etc. put/put the key into the lock.'

RTCs containing a dative-marked recipient can receive a similar analysis:

(43)   *fél kiflivég*   *gyerek-nek*   *oda*   *ad*
    [VP [V' [pP internal arg.   [P' PathP   p]]   V]]
    half croissant.tip   child-DAT   PRT   give
    'I/you/etc. give/gave a bit of croissant to the/a child.'

Appendix 4: Fine structure of RTC objects

Cf. Szabolcsi (1983), Szabolcsi (1994), Bartos (1999), Den Dikken (1999), Bartos (2000), É. Kiss (2000), Dékány (2011), Csirmaz and Dékány (2014), Egedi (2014) a.o.

(56)   [AdjP *új* [NP *kategória*]]   *létre-hoz*
    new   category   PRT-bring
    'I/you/he/she/etc. create(d) a new category.'

(57)   [NumP *három* [ClP *szál*   [NP *cigi*]]]   *el-szív*
    three   SPEC.CL   cigarette   PRT-suck
    'I/you/he/she/etc. smoke(d) three cigarettes.'

(58)   [NumP *négy* [Num' *darab*   [NP *imbusz*]]]   *ki-csavar*
    three   GEN.CL   Allen.screw   PRT-twist
    'I/you/he/she/etc. screw(ed) off three Allen screws.'

(59)   [NumP *két* [Num' [NP *sör*]]]   *meg-isz*
    two   beer   PRT-drink
    'I/you/he/she/etc. drink/drank two beers.'

(60)   [NumP [Num' *-ok*   [NP *ablak*]]] = *ablak-ok*   *be-csuk*
    PL   window   PRT-close
    'I/you/he/she/etc. close(ed) the windows.'

(61)   [QP *minden*   [NP *polc*]]   *le-töröl*
    every   shelf   PRT-wipe
    'I/you/he/she/etc. wipe(d) off every shelf.'

(62)   [QP *összes* [NP *ruha*]]   *le-vesz*
    all   cloth   PRT-take
    'I/you/he/she/etc. take/took off all the clothes.'

(63)   [AgrP *épület* [Agr' Ø   [PossP *-ja* [NP *ajtó*]]]] = *épület ajta-ja*   *be-csuk*
    building   3SG   POSS   door   PRT-close
    'I/you/he/she/etc. close(d) the door of the building.'

(64)   [AgrP *pro₁* [Agr' *-m* [PossP *-a* [NP *haj*]]]] = *haj-a-m*   *meg-szárít*
    1SG   1SG   POSS   hair   PRT-dry
    'I/you/he/she/etc. dry/dried my hair.'

References:

Ackerman, Farrel 1984. *Verb modifiers as argument taking predicates: complex verbs as predicate complexes in Hungarian.* Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik 25, 23-71.

Ackerman, Farrell. 1987. Pronominal Incorporation: The Case of Prefixal Adverbs. In István Kenesei (ed.) *Approaches to Hungarian 2.* JATE, Szeged. 213-260.

Ackerman, Farrell and Gert Webelhuth. 1998. *A Theory of Predicates.* CSLI Publications, Stanford.

Alberti, Gábor. 2004. Climbing for aspect: with no rucksack. In Katalin É. Kiss and Henk C. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *Verb Clusters: A Study of Hungarian, German, and Dutch.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 253-290.

Baker, Mark. 1985. The mirror principle and morphosyntactic explanation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16: 373–415.

Bartos, Huba. 1999. *Morfoszintaxis és interpretáció: a magyar inflexiós jelenségek szintaktikai háttere* [Morphosyntax and Interpretation: on the Syntax of Inflectional Phenomena in Hungarian] PhD dissertation. Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest.

Bartos, Huba. 2000. Az inflexiós jelenségek szintaktikai háttere [The syntactic background of inflexional phenomena]. In Ferenc Kiefer (ed.): *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan 3. Morfológia* [Hungarian structural grammar 3. Morphology] (pp. 653–761). Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Beghelli, Filippo and Tim Stowell. 1997. Distributivity and negation: the syntax of each and every. In Anna Szabolcsi (ed.) *Ways of Scope Taking.* Dordrecht: Kluwer. 71–108.

Bene, Annamária. 2005. *Az igék bennható/tranzitív/mediális felosztásának morfoszintaktikai következményei* [Unaccusatives, transitives and middles: A morphosyntactic account]. PhD dissertation. Eötvös Loránd U, Budapest.

Biberauer, Theresa, Anders Holmberg and Ian Roberts. 2014. A syntactic universal and its consequences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45: 169-225.

Bittner, Maria and Ken Hale. 1996. The structural determination of Case and Agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27:1–68.

Bowers, John. 1993. The syntax of predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 591–656.

Borik, Olga and Berit Gehrke (eds.). 2015. *The syntax and semantics of pseudo-incorporation.* Brill.

Brody, Michael. 1990. Remarks on the order of elements in the Hungarian Focus field. In István Kenesei (ed.) *Approaches to Hungarian 3.* JATE, Szeged. 95-122.

Brody, Michael. 1995. Focus and checking theory. In Kenesei, István (ed.) *Approaches to Hungarian 5.* JATE, Szeged. 29–44.

Bücking, Sebastian and Jennifer Rau. 2013. German non-inflectional constructions as separate performatives. In Daniel Gutzmann and Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.): *Expressives and Beyond. Explorations in Use-Conditional Meaning.* Leiden, Brill. 59-94.

Cecchetto, Carlo. to appear. *The Root Where It Should Not Be: On Internal Argument Drop Sentences in Italian.* Ms.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Csirmaz, Anikó. 2004. Particles and Phonologically Defective Predicates. In Katalin É. Kiss and Henk C. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *Verb Clusters: A Study of Hungarian, German, and Dutch.* John Benjamins. 225-252.

Csirmaz, Anikó. 2006. Aspect marking in a two-component theory of aspect. In Katalin É. Kiss (ed.) *Event Structure and the Left Periphery. Studies on Hungarian.* Dordrecht: Springer. 107-128.

Csirmaz, Anikó and Éva Dékány. 2014. Hungarian is a classifier language. In Simone, Raffaele, and Francesca Masini (eds.): *Word classes: Nature, typology and representations.* John Benjamins, 141-160.

Dikken, Marcel den. 1999. On the structural representation of possession and agreement: the case of (anti-)agreement in Hungarian possessed nominal phrases. *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science* Series 4: 137-178.

Dikken, Marcel den. 2004. Agreement and 'clause union'. In Katalin É. Kiss and Henk C. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *Verb Clusters: A Study of Hungarian, German, and Dutch.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 445-498.

Dékány, Éva. 2011. *A profile of the Hungarian DP: The interaction of lexicalization, agreement and linearization with the functional sequence.* PhD dissertation, University of Tromsø.

Dékány, Éva and Veronika Hegedűs. 2015. Word order variation in Hungarian PPs. In Balázs Surányi, Katalin É. Kiss and Éva Dékány (eds.) *Approaches to Hungarian 14: papers from the 2013 Piliscsaba conference.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 95-120.

Egedi, Barbara. 2014. The DP-cycle in Hungarian and the functional extension of the noun phrase. In Katalin. É. Kiss (ed.): *The evolution of functional left peripheries in Hungarian syntax.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 56–82.

É. Kiss, Katalin (ed.) 1995. *Discourse configurational languages.* Oxford University Press.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74: 245–273.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 1999. Strategies of Complex Predicate Formation and the Hungarian Verbal Complex. In István Kenesei (ed.) Crossing Boundaries. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. 91-114.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2000. The Hungarian NP is like the English NP. In Gábor Alberti and István Kenesei (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian 7: Papers from the Pécs conference,* Szeged: JATE, 119-150.

É. Kiss, Katalin 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2006. The function and the syntax of the verbal particle. In Katalin É. Kiss (ed.) *Event structure and the left periphery. Studies on Hungarian.* Dordrecht: Springer. 17-56.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2008. Free word order, (non) configurationality and phases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39: 441-475.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2009. Negative quantifiers in Hungarian. In Marcel den Dikken and Robert Vago (eds.) *Approaches to Hungarian 11.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins., 65-94.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2010a. An adjunction analysis of quantifiers and adverbials in the Hungarian sentence. *Lingua* 120:

506-526.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2010b. Structural focus and exhaustivity. In Malte Zimmermann and Caroline Féry (eds.) *Information Structure. Theoretical, Typological and Experimental Perspectives*. Oxford-New York: OUP. 64-88.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2011. *Differential object−verb agreement is (fossilized) topic−verb agreement*. Ms.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2013. From Proto-Hungarian SOV to Old Hungarian Top Foc V X. *Diachronica* 30: 202-231.

É. Kiss, Katalin. 2015. A negative cycle in 12th-15th-century Hungarian. In Theresa Biberauer, George Walkden (eds.) *Syntax over Time: Lexical, Morphological, and Information-Structural Interactions*. Oxford: OUP, 86-101.

Farkas, Donka and Henriëtte de Swart. 2003. *The semantics of incorporation: From argument structure to discourse transparency*. University of Chicago Press.

Fox, Danny. 1995. Economy and Scope. *Natural Language Semantic*s 3, 283-341.

Gärtner, Hans-Martin. 2017. Root infinitivals and modal particles. An interim report. In Josef Bayer and Volker Struckmeier (eds.) *Discourse Particles: formal approaches to their syntax and semantics*. De Gruyter. 115-143.

Guasti, Maria Teresa, and Luigi Rizzi. 2002. Agr and Tense as distinctive syntactic projektions: Evidence from acquisition. In Guglielmo Cinque (ed.) *The cartography of syntactic structures*. New York: OUP.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1987. Register variation in English: some theoretical observations. *Journal of English Linguistics, 20(2)*, 230-248.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1990. Understood subjects in English diaries. On the relevance of theoretical syntax for the study of register variation. *Multilingua* 9(2), 157-199.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2000. Remnant movement and OV order. In Peter Svenonius (ed.) *The derivation of VO and OV*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 69-96.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2003. Conditional clauses: External and internal syntax. *Mind and Language* 18, 317-339.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2010. The internal syntax of adverbial clauses. *Lingua*, 120(3), 628-648.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2017. Unspeakable sentences. *Linguistic Variation*, 17(2), 229-250.

Haider, Hubert. 1992. Branching & discharge. In Peter Coopmans, Martin Everaert and Jane Grimshaw (eds.) *Lexical Specification and Insertion*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 135–164.

Haider, Hubert. 2000. OV is more basic than VO. In Peter Svenonius (ed.) *The derivation of VO and OV*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 45-67.

Hegedűs, Veronika. 2013. *Non-verbal predicates and predicate movement in Hungarian*. PhD dissertation. LOT: U Tilburg

Hegedűs, Veronika (to appear). *P Heads in Complex Events*.

Hinterhölzl, Roland. 1997. A VO-based approach to verb raising. In Kiyomi Kusumoto (ed.) *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society 27*. Amherst: GLSA. 187–202.

Horvath, Julia. 1986. *FOCUS in the Theory of Grammar and the Syntax of Hungarian*. Foris, Dordrecht.

Horvath, Julia. 2004. Is 'Focus Movement' Driven by Stress? In Christopher Piñón and Péter Siptár (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian 9*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 131-158.

Hyams, Nina and Kenneth Wexler. 1993. On the grammatical basis of null subjects in child language. *LI*, 421-459.

Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 25. MIT Press.

Kenesei, István. 1986. On the logic of Hungarian word order. In Werner Abraham and Sjaak de Meij (eds.) *Topic, focus, and configurationality*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 143–159.

Koopman, Hilda and Anna Szabolcsi. 2000. *Verbal Complexes*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Kornfilt, Jaklin and Omer Preminger (2015). Nominative as no case at all: an argument from raising-to-accusative in Sakha. In Andrew Joseph and Esra Predolac (eds.) *Proceedings of the 9th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL9)*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. 109-120.

Koster, Jan. 1994. Predication incorporation and the word order of Dutch. In Guglielmo Cinque, Jan Koster, Jean-Yves Pollock, Luigi Rizzi and Raffaella Zanuttini (eds.) *Paths Toward Universal Grammar: Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 255–276.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the external argument from its verb. In Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring (eds.) *Phrase structure and the lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 109–137.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1998. Scope or Pseudo-Scope? Are There Wide-Scope Indefinites? In Susan Rothstein (ed.): *Events in Grammar*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 163–196.

Lasnik, Howard, and Mamoru Saito. 1992. *Move Alpha*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Marantz, Alec. 1992. Case and Licensing. In German Westphal, Benjamin Ao, and Hee-Rahk Chae (eds.) *Proceedings of the Eastern States Conference on Linguistics '91*, 234–252

Marácz, László. 1989. *Asymmetries in Hungarian*. PhD dissertation, University of Groningen.

Massam, Diane. 1992. Null objects and non-thematic subjects. *Journal of Linguistics*, 28(1), 115-137.

Massam, Diane. 2001. Pseudo noun incorporation in Niuean. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 19(1), 153-197.

Massam, Diane and Yves Roberge. 1989. Recipe context null objects in English. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20(1), 134-139.

Matushansky, Ora. 1995. Le sujet nul dans les propositions à temps fini en anglais. Maîtrise paper, Paris VIII.

Matushansky, Ora. 2012. On the internal structure of case in Finno-Ugric small clauses. *Finno-Ugric Languages and Linguistics* 1: 3-43.

Mithun, Marianne. 1984. The evolution of noun incorporation. *Language* 60:4 , 847-894.

Olsvay, Csaba. 2004. The Hungarian verbal complex: An alternative approach. In Katalin É. Kiss and Henk C. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *Verb Clusters: A Study of Hungarian, German and Dutch.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 391-333.

Olsvay, Csaba. 2006. Negative universal quantifiers in Hungarian. *Lingua* 116: 245-271.

Oravecz, Csaba, Tamás Váradi, Bálint Sass. 2014. The Hungarian Gigaword Corpus. In: *Proceedings of LREC.*

Piñón, Christopher. 1995. Around the Progressive in Hungarian. In István Kenesei (ed.) *Approaches to Hungarian 5.* JATE, Szeged, 153-190.

Puskás, Genovéva. 2000. *Word Order in Hungarian: The Syntax of Ā-Positions.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rákosi, György. 2015. Psych verbs, anaphors and the configurationality issue in Hungarian. In Katalin É. Kiss, Balázs Surányi and Éva Dékány (eds.): *Approaches to Hungarian 14*, 245-266.

Rebrus, Péter and Miklós Törkenczy. 2015. Monotonicity and the typology of front/back harmony. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 41(1–2), 1–61.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1995. *Interface Strategies.* OTS Working Papers, Utrecht.

Reinhart, Tanya. 1997. Quantifier Scope: How Labor is Divided Between QR and Choice Functions. *L&P 20*, 335–397.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2006. Grammatically-based target-inconsistencies in child language. In: Deen, K. U. , J. Nomura , B. Schulz & B. D. Schwartz (eds.): The Proceedings of the Inaugural Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition -North America). MIT Press.

Schlobinski, Peter (2001): *knuddel – zurückknuddel – dich ganzdollknuddel*. Inflektive und Inflektivkonstruktionen im Deutschen. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 29: 192–218.

Schütze, Carson T. 2001. On the nature of default case. *Syntax*, 4(3), 205-238.

Sportiche, Dominique. 2005. *Division of labor between merge and move: Strict locality of selection and apparent reconstruction paradoxes.* Ms. UCLA.

Surányi, Balázs. 2003. *Multiple operator movements in Hungarian.* PhD dissertation, University of Utrecht.

Surányi, Balázs. 2002. Negation and the negativity of n-words in Hungarian. In István Kenesei and Péter Siptár (eds.) *Approaches to Hungarian 8.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 107-132.

Surányi, Balázs. 2006a. Scrambling in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 53: 393-432.

Surányi, Balázs. 2006b. Quantification and focus in negative concord. *Lingua* 116: 272-313.

Surányi, Balázs. 2009a. Verbal particles inside and outside vP. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 56: 201-249.

Surányi, Balázs. 2009b. Locative particle and adverbial incorporation at the interfaces. In Katalin É. Kiss (ed.) Adverbs and Adverbial Adjuncts at the Interfaces. Berlin – New York, Mouton de Gruyter. 39-74.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1981. Compositionality in focus. *Folia Linguistica* 15: 141-162.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1994. The noun phrase. In Ferenc Kiefer and Katalin É. Kiss (eds.): The syntactic structure of Hungarian. San Diego/New York: Academic Press, 179–274.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1997. Strategies for scope taking. In Anna Szabolcsi (ed.) *Ways of Scope Taking.* Dordrecht: Kluwer. 109–154.

Szendrői, Kriszta. 2003. *A stress-based approach to the syntax of Hungarian focus.* The Linguistic Review 20, 37-78.

Teuber, Oliver. 1998. fasel schreib erwähn – Der Inflektiv als Wortform des Deutschen. *Germanistische Linguistik* 141, 7–26.

Tóth, Ildikó. 2000. *Inflected infinitives in Hungarian.* PhD dissertation, Tilburg University.

Varga, Diána. 2014. *A magyar felszólító mondatok szerkezete.* [The structure of imperatives in Hungarian.] PhD dissertation. Pázmány Péter Catholic University.

Weir, Andrew. 2017. Object drop and article drop in reduced written register. *Linguistic Variation, 17(2)*, 157-185.

Weisser, Philip, 2015. *Derived coordination: A minimalist perspective on clause chains, converbs and asymmetric coordination.* Walter de Gruyter.

Wexler, Ken. 1998. Very early parameter setting and the unique checking constraint: A new explanation of the optional infinitive stage. *Lingua* 106: 23-79.

Winter, Yoad. 1997. Choice Functions and the Scopal Semantics of Indefinites. *L&P 20*, 399–467.

Zwart, Jan Wouter. 1993. *Dutch Syntax: A minimalist approach.* PhD dissertation, U of Groningen. Groningen: Grodil.

Zwart, Jan Wouter. 1997. *Morphosyntax of Verb Movement. A minimalist approach to the syntax of Dutch.* Kluwer.