Author(s):

## DP-Internal Operators and their Scopal Interaction with Operators of the Verb

In Hungarian generative literature, serious attention is paid to information structure (consisting of different sorts of topics, quantifiers and foci), but the seminal works (e.g. Brody & Szabolcsi 2003, É. Kiss & Kiefer 1994, É. Kiss 2002, Surányi 2011) only focus on the operator zone belonging to the verb. The present paper concentrates on operators that belong to nominal heads and it discusses their scopal interaction with the verb's operators.

The first question that arises is which nominal heads can take arguments at all. Typically, three types of nominal heads qualify as argument-taking ones (Broekhuis & Keizer 2012, Chapter 2): deverbal nominals, which inherit the arguments of the input verbs (1); *story/picture* nouns, which are claimed to take an Agent and a Theme as their arguments in addition to a frequently occurring adjunct, the owner (2); and relational nouns (3). Based upon the scrutiny of scope relations, we designed a test in order to decide whether the "dependents" of nominal heads behave as verbal arguments, or as adjuncts, or as members of a 'conceptual frame' – a structure named and defined by Laczkó (2000:303) –, which can be seen as an intermediary status between argumenthood and adjuncthood.

(1)  a.  Elleneztem [$_{DP}$ mindkettőtök meghívását].
         disagreed-1Sg both-Poss2Pl  invitation-Poss3Sg-Acc
         1. 'In the case of the both of you, I was against the idea of invitation.' /
         2. 'I was against the idea of inviting you two together.'
         ✓MEANING1:  disagree > both > invite;      ✓MEANING2:  both > disagree > invite
     b.  Mindkettőtöknek$_{Quant/CTopic}$ elleneztem [$_{DP}$ a meghívását].
         both-Poss2Pl-Dat          disagreed-1Sg the invitation-Poss3Sg-Acc
         Version$_{Quant}$: *MEANING1 / ✓MEANING2;     Version$_{CTopic}$: ✓MEANING1 / *MEANING2

(2)  a.  Elfogadtam [$_{DP}$ mindkettőtök cikkét].
         accepted-1Sg  both-Poss2Pl    paper-Poss3Sg-Acc
         1. 'In the case of the both of you, I accepted your paper.' /
         2. intended meaning: 'I accepted the paper that the two of you had written together.'
         *MEANING1:  accept > both > paper;      ✓MEANING2:  both > accept > paper
     b.  Mindkettőtöknek$_{Quant/CTopic}$ elfogadtam [$_{DP}$ a cikkét].
         both-Poss2Pl-Dat          accepted-1Sg  the paper-Poss3Sg-Acc
         Version$_{Quant}$: *MEANING1 / ✓MEANING2;     Version$_{CTopic}$: *MEANING1 / *MEANING2

(3)  a.  Imádom [$_{DP}$ mindkettőtök nagyszüleit].
         admire-1Sg both-Poss2Pl  grandparents-Poss3Sg-Acc
         1. 'In the case of the both of you, I admire your grandparents.' /
         2. intended meaning: 'I admire the persons who are the mutual grandparents of you two.'
         *MEANING1:  admire > both > grandparents;  ✓MEANING2:  both > admire > grandparents
     b.  Mindkettőtöknek$_{Quant/CTopic}$ imádom [$_{DP}$ a nagyszüleit].
         both-Poss2Pl-Dat          admire-1Sg   the grandparents-Poss3Sg-Acc
         Version$_{Quant}$: *MEANING1 / ✓MEANING2;     Version$_{CTopic}$: *MEANING1 / *MEANING2

What the pairings of meanings with the sentences that illustrate the possessor's DP-internal / DP-external position ((a)-examples / (b)-examples) show first and foremost is a bidirectional scopal interaction between the DP's and the verb's syntactic domain. On the one hand, the DP-internal possessor as a quantifier can take scope over the matrix verb (see the (a)-examples). On the other hand, the DP-external possessor, in spite of its syntactic position above the matrix verb, will take the narrowest sentence scope if it is given a special rising intonation contour typical of contrastive topic (1b). As could be seen, however, this latter possibility is only available in the case of deverbal nominals (see also (2&3b)). This observation then leads to the following conclusions. A deverbal nominal has (that is, inherits)

a "real" argument structure which is capable of perfect scopal interaction with the verb's argument structure, whilst a non-deverbal nominal has no argument structure. The verb, however, in its own scopal hierarchy, readily ensures a high position to the possessor that belongs to the nominal head, independent of its DP-internal/external syntactic standing (2-3).

In contrast to Broekhuis & Keizer's (2012:120) standpoint/terminology and in harmony with Laczkó's (2000) approach, we argue that verbs and nouns are alike furnished with syntactic domains to be called their complements, and that these domains accommodate an argument structure (in the case of verbs and deverbal nouns) or a conceptual frame (in the case of non-deverbal nominals).

The distribution of the possible readings in the following example suggests that in the case of a deverbal noun, both the verbal and the nominal character can appear: the patient behaves as a verbal argument (in a "complex event" as in the sense used by Laczkó (2000:298-303)), whilst the agent proves to behave as a "conceptual argument".

(4) a. Elutasítom [$_{DP}$ mindkettőtök$^{Patient/Agent}$ kezelését].
    refuse-1Sg    both-Poss2Pl            treatment-Poss3Sg-Acc
    1. 'In the case of the both of you, I refuse to [treat] / [be treated by] you.' /
    2. 'I refuse to [treat] / [be treated by] the both of you at the same time.'
    Version$^{Patient}$: ✓MEANING1: refuse > both > treat; ✓MEANING2: both > refuse > treat
    Version$^{Agent}$: *MEANING1: refuse > both > treat; ✓MEANING2: both > refuse > treat
  b. Mindkettőtöknek$^{Pat/Ag}_{Quant/CTopic}$ elutasítom [$_{DP}$ a kezelését].
    both-Poss2Pl-Dat                    refuse-1Sg    the treatment-Poss3Sg-Acc
    Version$^{Patient}_{Quant}$: *MEANING1/ ✓MEANING2; Version$^{Patient}_{CTopic}$: ✓MEANING1/*MEANING2
    Version$^{Agent}_{Quant}$: *MEANING1/ ✓MEANING2; Version$^{Agent}_{CTopic}$: *MEANING1 /*MEANING2

The second part of the paper provides a systematic overview of which DP-internal and DP-external positions accommodate which of the inherent operators belonging to the nominal head (to which extent of grammaticality) – based on the table below. Also will be discussed the problem of scopal interaction among two arguments that belong to one nominal head – as concerns their interaction between each other and with the arguments that belong to the verb.

| | CONTR. TOPIC | PREVERBAL OP. POS. | DP-INTERNAL POSITIONS | | | | POST-VERBAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | BEFORE D | AFTER D | ATTRIB. | AFTER N | |
| F ('only') | ? | ✓ | ✓ | * | ✓ | * | * |
| Q ('all') | (?) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | (?) | ✓ |
| Q ('also') | * | ✓ | ? | * | * | ? | ✓ |

Brody, Michael & Anna Szabolcsi 2003. "Overt Scope in Hungarian". *Syntax* 6.1. 19–51.
Broekhuis, Hans & Evelien Keizer 2012. *Syntax of Dutch – Nouns and Noun Phrases, Vol I.* Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
Kiefer, Ferenc (ed.) 2000. *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan* [Hungarian Structural Grammar]. *II. Morfológia* [Morphology]. Akadémiai Kiadó, Bp.
Kiss, É. Katalin 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian.* Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
Kiss, É. Katalin & Ferenc Kiefer eds. 1994. *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian, Syntax and Semantics* 27. New York: Academic Press.
Laczkó, Tibor 2000. "Az ige argumentumszerkezetét megőrző főnévképzés [Nouns derivation preserving the argument structure of verb]". In Kiefer (2000), 293–407.
Surányi, Balázs 2011. *Freedom of Word Order and Domains for Movement: A Flexible Syntax of Hungarian.* Acad. dr. diss., RIL HAS.