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2. Current assumptions about the definiteness effect

The definiteness effect (DE) observable in many, if not all, languages can be characterized in the following general terms:

(1)a. Certain verbs (DE-verbs) may require that one of their arguments (the DE-argument) be an indefinite.

b. Indefinites are phrases of the sort men or two men [non-specific], as opposed to the man, Mary's man, every man or two men [specific].

c. The set of DE-verbs tends to contain at least the existential verb(s) of the language.

d. DE-arguments tend to be non-agentive and, whether accusative or not, can often be argued to be D-structure objects.

e. DE-arguments tend to be linked to an expletive in subject position.

One of the most interesting questions concerning the DE is
whether it is syntactic or semantic in nature. There have been two essentially different recent answers to this question, initiated in Milsark (1974, 1977) and Safir (1982), respectively.

Milsark's proposal is essentially semantic; its main ingredients are as follows. Definites contain a quantifier, indefinites at most a cardinality word; some phrases are ambiguous between the two. Be is an empty verb; there is an existential quantifier. Thus the co-occurrence of there and a definite amounts to double quantification, which is ill-formed or uninterpretable.

Safir's proposal is essentially syntactic. He criticizes Milsark on the following grounds. Even in English, the DE is not restricted to empty verbs; in languages other than English, it is not always concomitant with the appearance of a there-like element. Furthermore, certain minor changes in sentential structure may neutralize the DE. As all these facts are not predicted by the semantic proposal, he claims the explanation for the DE must be syntactic. DE-arguments are generated in a thematic (object) position where they cannot receive Case. Hence they must be moved, or linked, to a non-thematic Case position (subject). Given that the latter option violates the standard Binding Conditions, it is available only to items that may be temporarily exempted from the BCs. Exemption is possible with indefinites since they are "non-referential"; it is impossible with definites and they are consequently ruled out. Neutralization arises when a language finds a trick to assign Case to the critical position directly.

Reuland (1983) modifies Safir in two important respects. He observes that the DE arises even in directly Case-marked positions, and suggests that it is rather the non-thematic subject that is in need of linkage because, unless it is part of a theta-chain, it cannot satisfy the Extended Projection Principle. Furthermore, he proposes to replace exemption from the BCs by a different concept of Binding, inspired by Heim's (1982) file-keeping semantics.

Notice that their appeal to the semantic properties of
the DE-argument does not deprive these proposals of their syntactic nature. First of all, they make the extremely interesting claim that the motivation for the DE lies in pure syntax; indefiniteness of the DE-argument is merely instrumental in saving an otherwise illegitimate coindexing constellation. Secondly, provided that matters of referentiality do have systematic syntactic correlates, a theory that is basically uninterested in semantics may treat them as purely syntactic phenomena.

Let me point out, though, that this latter argument may be turned around. Namely, it seemed that Milsark's proposal was regarded unexplanatory, not because it had no intuitive appeal but, rather, because it failed to predict the peculiar distribution of the phenomenon. But let us assume, as above, that certain semantic matters have systematic correlates in syntax — in addition to both semantics and syntax having their own independently motivated principles. On this account a "semantic" proposal cannot necessarily be expected to make a full range of predictions on its own. All that can be expected is that in case the semantic notions involved do have syntactic correlates then these, in conjunction with purely syntactic principles, be able to predict the full range of data. A semantic proposal can only be expected to bear the sole responsibility for those data that do not fall within the domain of predictions made by "correlates plus pure syntax". And, conversely, exactly the same holds for a "syntactic" proposal as well.

If it happens that the full range of relevant data can be accounted for on the basis of "correlates" in interaction with principles of syntax and/or semantics, it appears it is a matter of taste, i.e. theory, whether one claims to have a syntactic, or a semantic, explanation. Barring simply biassed choices, however, it may still be the case that we are in a position to determine what sort of an explanation we have. Namely, it may well be the case that one of the "correlates" has a stipulative character within one of the two interacting domains, but not within the other. In the best possible world we devise a theory that comprises both
a serious syntax and a serious semantics, and also makes the

correlations between them principled.

I will not devise such a theory in this paper. However, I

will examine a set of facts a satisfactory account of which

seems hopeless to me without the joint efforts of syntax and

semantics, and will make some preliminary suggestions about

plausible correlations between the two domains.

3. The descriptive problem of Hungarian

Recall that both Safir's and Reuland's syntactic accounts of

the DE crucially presuppose a "configurational" sentence

structure, i.e. Case and θ-role assignment to distinguished

structural positions, and the existence of a canonical

subject. Reuland even notes that he predicts the DE to be

absent from languages with no canonical [NP,S1] position.

Are there any "non-configurational" languages? É. Kiss

(1981, 1984) claims Hungarian is such a language, that is,

at least in non-lexical, non-virtual structure it has no

canonical subject position, for instance. It may be the case

that at some other level Hungarian has a configurational

structure, or, even that its apparently non-configurational

properties can be derived, rather than needing to be

postulated. Apart from this, note that it is certainly true

that a variety of facts derived from such a configurational

structure in other languages are absent from Hungarian.

Given this background (and the lack of, at least overt,

expletives), it may be of some interest to ask: Does

Hungarian have the definiteness effect? Anticipating the

detailed description of the data below, let me now answer

the question as follows.

Both van 'be' and a sizable set of other verbs exhibit

the standard DE. There is also a major difference between

van and those verbs, however: the latter exhibit the DE when

they are accompanied only by their nominative or accusative

complement, respectively. The addition of something "extra",

in conjunction with placing something into Focus, eliminates

the DE. No such neutralization is possible for van.
My strategy will be to assume that the core DE-facts are the ones mentioned, that is, those "triggered" by some choice of the verb. I will not be concerned with where, in general, indefinites may occur (Pesetsky (1982, Chapter 2) can be seen as such an enterprise for Russian), nor with where, in general, indefinites must occur (Safir, Reuland). Given however that I do assume that the answers to these more ambitious questions must be coherent with the explanation of lexically triggered cases, my suggestions will also imply tentative partial answers to them.

4. The DE in action

4.1. DE-verbs and DE-arguments

DE-verbs fall into four main open classes that include:

(10a) verbs are very simple: they merely express EXIST.

(10b) verbs can be claimed to mean: BECOME AVAILABLE, IN A PARTICULAR FASHION.

(10c) verbs can be claimed to mean: CAUSE TO BECOME AVAILABLE, IN A PARTICULAR FASHION, where the subject is not an agent.

(10d) verbs can be claimed to mean: CAUSE TO BECOME EXISTENT, IN A PARTICULAR FASHION, where the subject is an agent.

I distinguished between existence and availability above because the DE-arguments of (10b,c) verbs do not 'come about' in the strict sense. This does not really seem to make a linguistic difference, however, and will be ignored below. (For an important discussion, see Wacha (1978).)

Verbs in (10a,b,c) do not, at least normally, occur in the progressive. (Progressivity in Hungarian is marked by word order and intonation, and actually tends to require
definite arguments.) Verbs in (10d) are the well-known "imperfective paradox" verbs. Just as we expect, they are DE-verbs only if they are not in the progressive.

As the above analyses, in the spirit of Dowty (1979), indicate, (10) has a clear semantic coherence to it. All its members have the EXIST component in common; moreover, all the members of (10b,c,d) have the BECOME component and the PARTICULAR FASHION component in common. These observations will become very important below.

Provided the usual notion of a D-structure object makes sense in Hungarian, all DE-arguments, whether they bear nominative or accusative case, may reasonably be assumed to be D-structure objects. What can be clearly demonstrated, however, is that they can all be incorporated in the following sense.

Following Ackerman and Komlósy's LFQ-inspired analysis, I will assume that Hungarian has a V-bar node both in the lexicon and in syntax. Due to Bracket Retention in the word formation component, the sister of V, the verbal modifier VM need not occur under V-bar in syntax; when it does, however, it perspicuously lacks contrastive Focus stress. VMs do not form a homogeneous class. They can be affixes acting as argument-taking predicates (11a), subcategorized predicates (11b,c,d), or arguments of the verb (11e):

Peter meg-won John-acc
'Peter convinced John'

b. Péter a szobában van.
Peter the room-in is
'Peter is in the room'

c. Péter aludni fog.
Peter sleep-inf will
'Peter will sleep'

d. Péter okos-nak tartja Jánost.
Peter smart-dat holds John-acc
'Peter considers John smart'
This typology of V-bars will have some significance below. Let us now return to DE-verbs, however.

Both accusative and oblique arguments (Hungarian has over twenty cases) are easily incorporated. It is therefore not surprising that it is possible to incorporate the accusative argument of (10c,d) verbs, e.g.:

(12)a. Péter könyv-et kapott.
   Peter book-acc got
   'Peter got a book'

Nominatives do not usually incorporate, however, therefore the grammaticality of the incorporation of the nominative argument of (10a,b) verbs — e.g. (12b) — is significant:

(12)b. Lányok-0 érkeztek.
   girls-nom arrived
   'There arrived girls'

(13)a. Lányok-Ø szomorkodtak / dolgoztak.
   girls-nom grieved worked

b. Lányok-Ø súlyosodtak / dolgoztak t1.
   girls-nom grieved worked
   'It is girls who grieved / worked'

It may also be important to note that while the perfective affix meg plus an intransitive V-stem can in general form a (semantically transparent or opaque) transitive V-bar, cf. (11a), meg plus an intransitive DE-V-stem never form a transitive V-bar. Every DE-V-stem has a meg-affixed V-bar counterpart, though, which is perfective and has a flavor of "fulfilled expectation", e.g.:

(14) A lányok meg-érkeztek.
   the girls meg-arrived
   'The girls arrived'

As (14) indicates, meg-érkezik no longer has the DE-property (rather, the other way round). This, however, is to be
expected, given that VM+V complexes are even lexically distinct from the V-stems they include. Therefore items as meg-van, meg-árkezik, meg-kap, meg-raizol will not feature in the discussion (and similarly for a szobában van).

4.2. Standard DE symptoms

The clearest DE-case can be made for van 'be', so let me use this for the purposes of introduction.

(15)a. Van könyv / két könyv / (némi) tej.
   'There is a book / two books / some milk'

b. Van a könyv / Mari könyve / minden könyv.
   'Is the book Mary's book every book'

c. Nincs könyv / két könyv / (semmi) tej.
   'There isn't any book / any two books / any milk'

d. Nincs a könyv / Mari könyve / minden könyv.
   'Isn't the book Mary's book every book'

e. A könyv / Mari könyve / van / nincs t.
   'The book Mary's book is isn't

Nincs is a suppletive form for *nem van 'not is'. Minden 'every' is meant to quantify over individual, and not kinds of, books; the latter reading is systematically available but in any respect indefinite. (15e) is not examined for minden because it never goes to Focus, in any case.

(15a-d) exhibit the usual DE symptoms. (15e) shows that even a radical change in the word order/intonation of the DE argument does not affect the DE.

The next important thing to observe is that in case sentences with other (i.e. "particular fashion") DE-verbs contain nothing else than this verb plus its DE-argument, they pattern exactly like van-sentences. Given that the non-Hungarian reader has to trust my assignment of stars anyway, let me not proliferate the paradigms and use kap 'get' as the representative of the equivalence class of "particular fashion" DE-verbs in what follows.
(16a. Kaptam könyvet / két könyvet / (némi) tejet.
   'I got a book / two books / some milk'

b. Kaptam a könyvet / M. könyvét / minden könyvet.
   got-I the book-acc M's book-acc every b-acc

c. Nem kaptam könyvet / két könyvet / (semmi) tejet.
   not got-I book-acc two book-acc any m-acc
   'I didn't get any book / any two books / any milk'

d. Nem kaptam a könyvet / M. könyvét / minden könyvet.
   not got-I the book-acc M's book-acc every b-acc

e.  P A könyvet / M. könyvétj (nem) kaptam ti.
   the book-acc M's book-acc (not) got-I

The paradigms (15) and (16) are also identical in the sense
that even két könyv 'two books' must be non-specific in
(16a) and within the scope of negation in (16c). Needless
to say, none of the restrictions displayed in (16) apply to
verbs like lét 'see'.

5. Partial neutralization of the DE

So far van 'be' and particular fashion DE-verbs patterned
together. As has already been mentioned in Section 3,
however, from now on their behavior will radically diverge.
In this section I will only review the most perspicuous
data; further subtleties will be introduced later. In short,
the addition of something 'extra' to the sentence, in
conjunction with the placement of something into Focus,
neutralizes the DE for particular fashion DE-verbs, with
a few remnants. On the other hand, it does not make any
difference for van 'be' — the DE remains unaffected. Given
that Safir (1982) is correct in saying that neutralization
possibilities are (also) diagnostic for the essence of a
phenomenon, let us look at them in some detail.

First of all, what is an "extra"? Clearly, VMs (verbal
modifiers) may not count as extras here because, as I have
argued in Section 4.1, VM+V complexes are lexically distinct
from the V's they contain. (Remember that not only affixes
like még have to be discounted in view of this, but also conceivable space adverbs, cf. (11b). Kap 'get' has no such VM, so the representative example does not involve this analytic problem. As for other verbs in (10), the reader is invited to trust that I have carefully examined the complement structure of each, and checked the effect of, say, adding a goal to érkezik 'arrive', which can be its VM, against the effect of adding a source, which cannot.

VMs discounted, I will say that practically anything may count as an extra — for instance, a subject spelled out, a time adverb, a source, a cause. Even though this notion of extras is very vague, it will have some importance below.

Now the most perspicuous generalization is as follows:

(17) The addition of an extra to sentences with particular fashion DE-verbs, in conjunction with the placement of something to Focus, neutralizes the DE with two basic exceptions:

(i) minden 'every' does not have all the scope options available to it in normal sentences, and

(ii) direct negation on the verb retains the DE.

I will comment on the significance of the addition of an extra and of the Focussing requirement below. In this section I will merely demonstrate how (17) manifests itself in concrete sentences. (A word of warning: notice that in (17) I claim that it does not matter which constituent of the sentence is placed into Focus. In the examples below I will omit traces for the sake of simplicity.)

Let me first give a set of examples involving a definite description in the place of the DE-argument:

(18)a. [P A könyvet] kaptam Pétertől.
   the book-acc got-I from P
   'It is the book that I got from Peter'

   not the book-acc got-I from P
   'It is not the book that I got from Peter'
c. \[ \text{I} \text{P A könyvet nem kaptam Pétertől.} \]
   'It is the book that I didn’t get from Peter'

(19)a. \[ \text{I P Tegnap I kaptam a könyvet.} \]
   'It was yesterday that I got the book'

b. Nem \[ \text{I P tegnap I kaptam a könyvet.} \]
   'It was not yesterday that I got the book'

c. \[ \text{I P Tegnap I nem kaptam a könyvet.} \]
   'It was yesterday that I didn’t get the book'

d. \[ \text{I P Mikor I kaptam a könyvet?} \]
   'When did I get the book?'

(20)a. \[ \text{I P Én I kaptam a könyvet.} \]
   'It is me who got the book'

b. Nem \[ \text{I P én I kaptam a könyvet.} \]
   'It is not me who got the book'

c. \[ \text{I P Én I nem kaptam a könyvet.} \]
   'It is me who didn’t get the book'

d. \[ \text{I P Kil kaptan a könyvet?} \]
   'Who got the book?'

The observation in (17ii) can be illustrated, not only by a comparison of the (b) and the (c) examples, but also with reference to a more sophisticated case:

(21) \[ \text{I P Péter nem kap-hat-ta a könyvet,} \]
   'It is Peter for who it is impossible to have got the book' (says Sherlock Holmes)
The negative particle in (21) immediately precedes the verb, just as in the (c) examples. Nevertheless, on the intended interpretation the modal operator intervenes between negation and the proposition containing that verb, and the sentence is grammatical.

As for minden 'every' in the place of the DE-argument, I will use only one sort of extra, and omit negative examples, for the sake of brevity. Again, the reader is invited to trust that I am not hiding any counterexamples to the claims in (17).

(22)a. \textit{\^{I}p} Tegnap \textit{\^{I}p} kaptam 'minden könyvet.} 
yesterday got-I every book-acc 
'For every book, it was yesterday that I got it'

b. \textit{\^{I}p} Tegnap \textit{\^{I}p} kaptam \textit{\^{I}p} minden könyvet. 
yesterday got-I every book-acc 
'It was yesterday that I got every book'

c. \textit{\^{I}p} Mikor\textit{\^{I}p} kaptam (')minden könyvet? 
when got-I every book-acc 
'When did I get every book?'

(22a,b) differ with respect to the stress, and consequently, the scope of minden 'every' (Hunyadi 1981, É. Kiss 1984). In (22a) the universal has wider scope than the Focussing operation applied to \textit{tegnap}, and the sentence is grammatical. In (22b) the universal has narrower scope than Focus, and the sentence is out. (22c) is in fact a test case that serves to confirm the above intuition. Quantifiers never take scope over wh-words in Hungarian. Hence the presence of a wh-extra excludes the wide scope interpretation for minden. The fact that the sentence is ungrammatical shows that the narrow scope option is really unavailable.

6. A shopping-list of problems
We have already seen enough of the DE in Hungarian to be able to enumerate a set of problems calling for answers.

(23) Why do exactly the verbs in (10) exhibit the DE?
(24) What is the significance of the fact that all DE-
arguments can be incorporated?

(25) Why do particular fashion DE-verbs only exhibit the DE when they are tête-à-tête with the DE-argument? Or, to put it in another way: why does the addition of an extra make a difference for these verbs but not for van 'be'?

(26) What is the significance of the Focussing requirement?

(27) Why do narrow scope minden 'every' and direct negation remain excluded in any case?

(28) What property do indefinites, versus definites, have in common?

Recall that in Section 3 I noted that both Safir's and Reuland's accounts of the DE were contingent upon the existence of a canonical subject position, which Hungarian may not have. I will indeed assume that Hungarian is "non-configurational" in the relevant sense. In order to free the coming discussion from the burden of being too obviously contingent upon this, however, let me briefly consider, and discard, one explanation along the canonical subject lines. For this purpose I will sketch a more or less plausible hypothesis of how apparently non-configura- tional properties of Hungarian could be derived from a configurational structure.

Suppose Hungarian sentences have a structure of the following sort:

(29) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FOCUS} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

This structure resembles Horvath's (1981) in that it has a distinguished subject position but avoids placing FOCUS into an argument position within VP. The effect of getting Focussed elements always next to the verb is achieved by some evacuation rule, not quite unlike Stylistic Inversion (a logical possibility mentioned in Ackerman (1981) and by Kayne, p.c.). Suppose, furthermore, that after evacuation
we no longer have a canonical subject position.

Now the argument might go as follows: DE-arguments are generated somewhere in VP. If there is nothing in Focus, the canonical subject position is occupied by an empty expletive. For some reason, this expletive and the DE-argument are coindexed, with creates the familiar binding problem unless the DE-argument is indefinite. Now remember the Focussing requirement in (17) and suppose that in fact that is the main factor. If we move something to Focus, the subject must be evacuated and, therefore, the coindexing problem and the DE disappears. Hence Reuland’s prediction concerning the minimal difference between sentences with, and without, such a canonical [NP,S] position is borne out.

This rather mechanical application of the familiar reasoning to the alleged configurational structure (29) does not, of course, answer all the problems on the list. If, however, it looks promising it might be refined and also supplemented with auxiliary hypotheses. Therefore, I have to show that it is not even promising enough to be pursued any further.

First, remember that even though Safir (1982) assumes that in subject pro-drop sentences we have an expletive empty element in subject position, his treatment does not, and obviously, must not, imply that subject pro-drop as such triggers the DE. But note that DE-sentences with transitive verbs, e.g. (16b) and (16d), could not, on this analysis, differ from normal pro-drop sentences.

Second, consider DE-sentences with intransitive verbs, which still have some chance. Here we have to face the problem that Focussing eliminates the DE for érkezik ‘arrive’ but not for van ‘be’. The reason why (30b) remains ungrammatical is not that van does not tolerate Focussing or extras: it does, if the subject is kept indefinite:

(30)a. [p Tegnap ] volt tej.
   'It is yesterday that there was some milk'
(30)b. [p Tegnap ] volt a tej.
   'It is yesterday that there was the milk'
This, of course, is just one analysis, the failure of which does not prove anything with respect to the conceivable success of the enterprise in general. However, I believe that even the two problems mentioned above are sort of telling. Therefore I will have some confidence in looking for an explanation of the DE — in Hungarian and in general — which is independent of the existence of a non-thematic canonical subject position, and which also has something to say about all the problems on my list. By this I obviously do not mean to say, though, that in an uncontroversially configurational language no DE can be created in the way Safir and Reuland assume. All I mean to suggest is that the essence of the DE lies somewhere else.

7. Milsark updated

The reader may have already guessed that I believe the essence of the DE has to do with semantics. Nevertheless, Safir is inevitably right in saying that in case the DE is possible without a there-like element then Milsark must be wrong insofar as his theory is contingent on there being an existential quantifier. This criticism can be said to apply also to works following Milsark in this respect, e.g. Barwise and Cooper (1981).

Are we, however, forced to locate the existential quantifier in there? It may well be located in the verb, similarly to Carlson's (1978) assumption, or in some other way. In fact, Fred Landman suggested that have (which is clearly a DE-verb at least in relational noun contexts) be treated in the same way as there is in Barwise and Cooper, i.e. as a logical predicate of existence (Partee, p.c.):

\[
(31) \text{have: } \lambda z \forall y (\lambda x (x = y))
\]

I will also take this route and identify EXIST, introduced in Section 4.1, with a logical predicate of existence.

With this recognition Milsark's assumption (and Safir's criticism) that be must be an empty verb also loses its relevance. Recall that all Hungarian DE-verbs were claimed to have this EXIST component in their lexical meanings, and
suppose that such a claim can be supported by a serious theory of lexical decomposition, along the lines in Dowty (1979), which allows us to separate logical operators from other stuff in word meanings. In that case we can safely say that EXIST may exhaust, or be part of, the lexical meaning of a verb.

Although my reference to EXIST does not yet explain why van 'be' and particular fashion DE-verbs begin to diverge at some point, and why, say, English arrive and get do not exhibit the DE, this much will already give a hint why exactly the verbs in (10) are DE-verbs in Hungarian.

Prior to proceeding to the questions just mentioned, let me briefly examine that part of Milsark's claim that indefinites may only contain a weak determiner (a cardinality word), while definites contain a strong determiner (a real quantifier). Notice that having switched from there being an existential quantifier to having an existential predicate in/for the verb we also lost something: why cannot this predicate be applied to definites, if what they have in common is just that they contain a quantifier? Barwise and Cooper (1981), and recently, de Jong and Verkuyl (1984) have also revisited this part of Milsark's claim within the framework of generalized quantifiers. I will not review now these proposals in detail, just indicate their main point.

De Jong and Verkuyl argue that indefinites do not impose any restriction on the cardinality of the set denoted by the noun in them, whereas definites do. In other words, definites denote only if that set is not empty. Of course, the claim that definites carry an existential presupposition has been made ever since Frege, and also in Hausser (1976), Heim (1982). Nevertheless, such a claim has been formerly made sort of separately for each case; moreover, de Jong and Verkuyl's proposal has solid and systematic model theoretic foundations. (It also has more syntactic relevance than Barwise and Cooper's. I will return to this below.) As a matter of fact, de Jong and Verkuyl do not distinguish between the specific and the non-specific readings of
phrases like two men, and give just one (indefinite/weak) reading. In this respect I would rather follow Milsark in postulating an ambiguity (cf. also Fodor and Sag (1982)). The required modification would not create any problem for their system.

With this existential presupposition in mind, de Jong and Verkuyl go on to argue, like Barwise and Cooper, that in case a verb asserts existence in the strict logical sense, the occurrence of a presuppositional item is ruled out with reference to tautologousness, and in case a verb asserts non-existence in the strict logical sense, the occurrence of a presuppositional item is ruled out with reference to contradictoriness. This is the DE. Indefinites i.e. non-presuppositional items are never ruled out: they are harmless.

I will not go into details with the intuitive explanation of why precisely these kinds of tautologies and contradictions may create ungrammaticality in natural language (as opposed to the grammaticality of rectangular circle). Let me note, however, that it appears a tautology is easier to "tamper with" than a contradiction.

8. Verb meanings

In this section I will examine what we can make of the Hungarian data in the light of these considerations. My presentation will be very informal, for two reasons. One, I will try to convey an impression of the meanings of the Hungarian sentences to non-native speakers. Second, I will sometimes have to rely on parts of the grammar about which I only have pretheoretical generalizations available for the time being.

8.1. On problems (23), (25), and (26)

Recall the claim that all Hungarian DE-verbs have an EXIST component in their lexical meanings. To this I can now add the following. When we say things like (32),

(32)a. Érkezett egy levél.
   arrived a letter
b. Született egy gyerek.

was born a child

we just mean that there became available/existent a letter, or a child. Of course, there is no mistaking of the mailman for the mother, i.e. the verbs are not interchangeable, but the PARTICULAR PASHION component of their meanings is absolutely pushed to the background. For instance, (32a) is in sharp contrast with (33), which means that an object having its own independent existence completed a certain sort of change of location:

(33) Meg-érkezett egy levél.

meg-arrived a letter

In case we have a function noun like vendég 'guest' in the place of levél 'letter', we may even contemplate that meg-érkezik can only be applied to egy vendég if that person had been invited, which implies he had qualified as a guest ever since. On the other hand, in some cultures at least, a person may become a guest by simply turning up in a house as well — in this case, however, érkezik and only érkezik is the appropriate expression.

Note that the only reason why I am using commonplace noun—verb combinations is that I imagine this helps with illustration; the phenomenon is not restricted to such pairs. The same reasoning applies to transitive DE-verbs, too. I will not go into details with that but rather refer the reader to extremely similar considerations in connection with verbs participating in the "imperfective paradox". We may summarize these observations as follows. All the verbs in (10) can be used in such a way that the (BECOME) EXIST component of their meanings features most prominently. In that case the argumentation reviewed in Section 7 naturally carries over to them: their designated argument must be indefinite.

Let us now turn to cases of neutralization, however. In Section 5 I claimed that the coincidence of two factors is necessary for neutralization: the appearance of an extra, and the placement of something into Focus.
Consider first the role the addition of an extra may play in the process of neutralization. Remember that the verbs for which neutralization is possible have a PARTICULAR FASHION component in their lexical meanings, even though it is not very prominent in the use described above. It appears, however, that this component may be "highlighted" by the specification of any circumstance related to it, in which case these verbs become sort of normal verbs. The role of the extra, then, consists in its highlighting function. The reason why extras do not make any difference for van 'be' is straightforward: van has no PARTICULAR FASHION component that could be highlighted.

This attempt at an explanation is supported by another version of mere DE-verb plus DE-argument sentences I have not mentioned yet. In this case the verb itself receives contrastive Focus stress:

(34) KAPTAM a könyvet, nem LOPTAM.

' I GOT (=was GIVEN) the book, I didn't STEAL it'

This sentence takes the availability of the book for granted and focuses on the particular fashion it got into my possession. The extent to which this pattern is possible with various verbs is dependent on how easy it is to find a contrasting pair; a good context works wonders on each.

If this is correct, why is it also necessary to place something into Focus, however, in order to achieve neutralization? It might appear Focussing merely enhances the highlighting effect in some pragmatic sense. While this pragmatic contribution may indeed be relevant, I wish to argue Focussing has a different, and crucial, role. Namely, it conspires with highlighting to create verbs that do not exist in fact.

Compare the following two sentences:

(35)a. Főztem a levest a konyhában.

b. Kaptam a könyvet a konyhában.

Both sentences are bound to have an even intonation now, and (35a) is grammatical, while (35b) is not. Observe, however, what they can (be intended to) mean:

(35a) 'I was cooking the soup in the kitchen'
(35b) 'I was being given the book in the kitchen'

That is, both sentences receive an imperfective/progressive interpretation. But, of course, főz, just like cook, is a verb that can be imperfective, in which case the sentence describes the activity and does not entail the creation of a result — kap, just like get, be given is not such a verb.\(^2\)

The correlation of aspect and word order/intonation has been observed in Hungarian literature ever since the turn of this century. While the phenomenon is in no way well understood as yet, all researchers agree as to the basic empirical generalizations, also including the following:\(^3\)

(36) Focussing obliterates aspectual distinctions.

Now consider (35a,b) with Focussing:

(37)a. [P A konyhában főztem a levest.]
   the kitchen-in cooked-I the soup-acc
   'It was in the kitchen that I cooked(?)/was cooking(?) the soup'

b. [P A konyhában kaptam a könyvet.]
   the kitchen-in got-I the book-acc
   'It was in the kitchen that I was given(?)/was being given(?) the book'

The aspectual interpretation we get is vague, rather than either-or. What vague aspect is to be is obviously an unclear theoretical matter, so I will refrain from making any decisive claims here. Just note that, on the one hand, these sentences are indeed entirely grammatical and, on the other, one feels that it is "unnecessary" to have affix meg here to achieve perfectivity — while, at the same time, the lack of this affix makes it non-obvious that the soup/book had existed/been available prior to the event in the kitchen.\(^4\)

Let me now try to spell out what I meant by saying that
highlighting plus Focussing conspire to create verbs that do not exist. Érkezik 'arrive', kap 'get', főz 'cook', and their brothers in (10) are indeed verbs of creation in the sense sketched above in terms of BECOME and EXIST. They need an indefinite designated argument (and may incorporate it, see also below). Meg-érkezik, meg-kap, meg-főz etc. are not verbs of creation. They denote the completion of a process that is intimately related to what I called the PARTICULAR FASHION component of DE-verb meanings; that process may, or may not, exist on its own, however. Therefore the meg-verbs are not necessarily members of "aspectual pairs".

In view of this, we can claim that neutralization of the DE is, strictly speaking, no more possible with particular fashion verbs than with van 'be'. What appear to be cases of neutralization involve pseudo-verbs. Pseudo-verbs are not self-contained lexical items but emerge from extracting the PARTICULAR FASHION component of DE-verb meanings, in conjunction with the obliteration of aspectual distinctions.

Without making entirely irresponsible claims about other languages, let me note that these observations, if correct, suggest that cross-linguistic variation both in the inventory and in the manifestation of DE-phenomena must be predictable in part on the basis of how aspectual matters are lexicalized/expressed in various languages. For instance, arrive in English participates in there-sentences but is not limited to them. This may simply be due to the fact that it "conflates" the meanings of érkezik and megérkezik, which are two distinct lexical items in Hungarian.

8.2. On problem (27)

In a similarly informal manner, let me now turn to the cases in which the DE failed to become neutralized. These cases are puzzling now. After all, whether they be pseudo-verbs or real lexical items, kap and its brothers combine with definites to form entirely grammatical sentences. I will suggest that the two kinds of exception to the neutralization of the DE observed in Section 5 are in fact independent of each other.
First, remember that direct negation on the verb retains the DE. My tentative characterization of (37a,b) gives a hint, although not a rigorous explanation, of why the negated version may not survive. Consider (38):

(38) \[ \text{konyhában} \text{ nem kaptam a könyvet.} \]
\[ \text{the kitchen-in not got-I the book-acc} \]
'It was in the kitchen that I did not get the book'

At best, nothing happened in the kitchen to the effect that the book become existent/available to me. In this case the independent existence of the book must be taken for granted — the lack of neg makes it extremely dubious, however. At worst, we get back the kind of contradiction mentioned in Section 7. (Remember also the BECOME component, and the negated earlier state presupposition typically associated with change of state verbs in Givón (1972).) Further work on the nature of "vague aspect" should also make this point clearer.

The second restriction concerned the scope of minden 'every'. As was shown in (22), the universal quantifier has to take scope over the Focussing operation; the narrow scope option is unavailable. To appreciate the contrast, I will first provide a "normal" sentence where both options are available:

(39)a. \[ \text{I saw-I every book-acc} \]
\[ \text{'For every book, it was me who saw it'} \]

b. \[ \text{I saw-I every book-acc} \]
\[ \text{'It was me who saw every book'} \]

The situation described in (39a) is as follows. It is understood that "no line" corresponds to "no seeing":

(39a' )

\[ I \]  
\[ \text{book}_1 \]  
\[ \text{book}_2 \]  
\[ \text{book}_3 \]  
\[ \text{book}_4 \]  
\[ \text{Mary} \]  
\[ \text{Bill} \]  
\[ \text{John} \]
Although the situation described in (39b) is also logically compatible with the above diagram, its meaning proper is weaker. It may for instance correspond to:

\[(39b')\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{I} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{book} _1 \\
\text{book} _2 \\
\text{book} _3 \\
\text{book} _4 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Mary} \\
\text{Bill} \\
\text{John} \\
\end{array}
\]

Crucially, (39b) entails the possibility for each book to have been seen by several people — which is obviously fine.

Now consider the same sentences with kap 'get' in the place of let 'see', where the reading corresponding to the diagram in (39b') is unavailable. We may now suspect why it is excluded — because the same book cannot be transferred to several people at the same time (I am assuming that the creation of collective ownership counts as one transfer).

This suspicion may be corroborated by another piece of data that has not been mentioned earlier, and which would otherwise seem entirely mysterious. Namely, normally any Focus phrase in Hungarian can be prefixed with csak 'only'. Notice however the following exceptional contrast:

\[(40)a. \quad \text{Én} \quad \text{kaptam} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{könyvet}.\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{I} \\
\text{got-I} \\
\text{the book-acc} \\
\end{array}
\]

'It was me who got the book'

\[(40)b. \quad \text{Csak} \quad \text{Én} \quad \text{kaptam} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{könyvet}.\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{only} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{got-I} \\
\text{the book-acc} \\
\end{array}
\]

'Only I got the book'

It appears that (40a) merely identifies the receiver of the book, in contrast with other conceivable receivers, whereas (40b) also entails that the very same book could have been transferred to several separate people at the same time, of whom only the one named in Focus actually got it. This is the same entailment that was excluded in connection with the interpretation of the scope of the universal quantifier.

Moreover, the narrow scope minden / csak parallelism exhibited by a Focussed receiver extends to sentences with a
Focussed source or a focussed time point as well; and it extends to sentences with other verbs in (10).

I cannot help concluding that all these verbs are associated with a "conceptual frame" requiring for there to be a unique receiver, a unique source, a unique time point etc. for each event they describe. Given this requirement, sentences that entail the possibility of there being several receivers, several sources, or several time points for the same event are ruled out.

Note, incidentally, that this frame is certainly sensible in that it does not require, for instance, for someone to get a unique thing at a time, from Peter etc. That is, (41) is grammatical:

(41) Csak ir, a könyvetü kap tam most / Pétertől.
only the book-acc got-I now from P
"Only the book did I get now / from Peter"

(The corresponding test case with the universal cannot be constructed here, because it is the De-argument now that is in Focus.)

Can we make any further predictions on the basis of the assumption that narrow scope 'every' and 'only' prefixation are excluded by a conceptual frame that imposes a unicity requirement on certain factors of each getting etc. event? The answer is yes. We can predict that in case the sentence can be forced to be interpreted relative to several getting etc. events, this reading and 'only' must become available.

Such an interpretation can particularly easily be forced by adding an overt or covert bound variable to the definite. (Similar examples may be constructed with tense operators but they are too complex to use them here.) E.g.:

(42)a. Csak ép én] kaptam azt a könyvet,
only I got-I that the book-acc
amit akartam.
that wanted-I
"Only for x = I, x got the book x wanted" (i.e.
other people also got books but not according to their respective wishes)
b. [p Én] kaptam minden könyv-\((e\text{-}m)\)-ét Pétertől.
   \(\text{I got-I every book-(poss-lsg)-acc from P}\)
   'For \(x = \text{I}\), \(x\) got every book of \(x\)'s from Peter'
   (i.e. other people's books were supplied by
   someone else)

Finally, note that this restriction, if "conceptual", can be expected to hold irrespective of whether getting etc. is to be a "creative event" or a mere "transfer". That is, it can be expected to hold whether we have \(\text{kap}\) or \(\text{meg-kap}\) in the sentence. This expectation is actually fulfilled. Even if we use \(\text{meg-kap}\), narrow scope 'every' and prefixation of 'only' are impossible unless we can get a several events interpretation, in the way illustrated in (42) or with tense operators.

### 8.3. Evaluation of the results

In 8.1. I suggested that the particular fashion DE-verbs in (10b,c,d) are indeed verbs of creation, whence the argument reviewed in Section 7 carries over to them in a rather straightforward manner. The claim that the DE-phenomena of Hungarian are of a lexical/aspectual semantic nature was corroborated by the way in which they could be "neutralized".

In 8.2. I suggested that the direct negation exception to "neutralization" may actually be related to the tentative semantics I gave for pseudo-verbs, whereas the problem of the universal quantifier is entirely independent of the DE.

Some of the answers I have thus provided for the problems on our shoppinglist are not theoretically very interesting in themselves, especially in the above informal presentation. Their significance lies in the fact that they clear the way for a theoretically interesting analysis of the DE. That is, they help us avoid falling into the trap of trying to account for a bunch of data in modules of the grammar where they do not belong.
9. Substantiation in syntax and semantics

The reader, who had been promised an account of the DE that relies on the joint efforts of syntax and semantics, may already be anxious to see the syntax part of his cake. The best way to begin to serve it may be to recall that in 4.1, I claimed that all DE-arguments, whether nominative or accusative, can be incorporated. Anticipating part of the argumentation below, let me now strengthen this claim and rephrase problem (24) as follows:

\[(43) \text{Whenever the designated argument of a verb of (10) must be indefinite, it must be incorporated. Why?}\]

Ignoring some variation in analyses and, possibly, data, the strengthened claim bears a certain resemblance to what has been claimed about DE-arguments in other languages, namely, that they are generated in a D-structure object position. Let me examine this latter claim first.

It appears to me that the syntactic data supporting the placement of DE-arguments are overwhelming; the explanation of why they are placed there is not. As far as I know the literature, the only explanation, if any, tends to be that these arguments bear a Theme role. I have two problems here.

First, in theories that make no specific claims about the nature of each thematic (\(\Theta\)) role it is sort of difficult to tell whether something is really a Theme or not. It seems correct to say that these items do not have an Agent role; on the other hand, the nominative argument of, say, arrive is certainly not "affected" in the way Themes of transitive verbs are. (For an explicit discussion of this notion of "affected" and its significance in surface case-marking systems, see Komlósy (1982).)

Second, let us ask how this item is assigned its \(\Theta\)-role, whatever it is. This question arises as soon as the claim that DE-verbs are (may be) "empty" is taken any seriously. Notice that the emptiness claim is not peculiar to Milsark. For instance, Safir also takes the be of there-sentences to be meaningless. Now, it is true he hardly discusses sentences like (44),
(44) There are many unhappy people. because he claims this be takes a small clause complement, within which many unhappy people receives the external θ-role:

(45) There are [many unhappy people in the room]. Nevertheless, this only seems to shift the problem to the small clause. In Chomsky (1981) and Stowell (1981) small clauses are Arguments in the sense of the θ-criterion, i.e., they need a θ-role. Now, it is tempting to believe that the θ-role assigning properties of a verb, including its ability to assign a θ-role at all, are dependent on its meaning. Let us assume the following:

(46) An "empty" verb does not assign a specific θ-role. This implies that the NP or small clause complement of an empty verb may not be an Argument. Depending on whether we assume the existence of a non-specific θ-role, we may have a choice between qualifying it as a quasi-argument or as a non-argument; an issue to be taken up later in this section. Prior to going into details with this, it may be useful to devote some attention to the empty verb itself. Nothing in the theory prohibits the existence of such items but we probably do not want them to go wild. With the following notion of "emptiness" in mind, we can assume (47):

(47)a. Substantiation (semantics): Every predicate of natural language must have some non-logical content.
b. Substantiation (syntax): If the lexical meaning of a predicate contains at most logical constants and variables, it must enter into the "closest possible" syntactic relationship with something whose lexical meaning also contains some non-logical constant.

With respect to θ-role assigning abilities, this implies something like the following:

(48) A predicate may only fail to be (part of) an
assigner of a specific \( \theta \)-role if and only if it has its own non-logical content; a situation typical for weather-verbs, for instance.

Both the nature of my reasoning and the recognition that epistemic modals, for instance, may also be analyzable as mere logical constants, make the connection between this sketch and Zubizarreta's (1982) theory of adjuncts fairly obvious. The main tactical difference is, perhaps, that Zubizarreta takes the syntactic notion of modification as a point of departure, and is primarily interested in the behavior of the \( \theta \)-role an optional modifier (adjunct) may assign. She says it only combines with an Argument-\( \theta \)-role in LF; that is, the presence of an adjunct-assigned \( \theta \)-role may neither save nor rule out an Argument in view of Chomsky's \( \theta \)-criterion. She is not really interested in why the modification relation arises, what role obligatory modifiers play, and whether or not an adjunct really assigns a \( \theta \)-role. On the other hand, I am forced to be primarily interested in empty predicates that do not assign any \( \theta \)-role whatsoever, and wish to say that they must get "attached to" something substantial. It seems that the two proposals form a coherent whole together. The formal relation between them could be clarified if I used more precise and more general formulations. I will not undertake this task here.

Let us return to problem (43), however. In accordance with the informal characterization I gave in Section 8, I will assume that not only van "be" but all verbs in (10) are empty of non-logical content when they require their designated argument to be indefinite. Thus, the necessity of incorporation follows from (47): the incorporated item substantiates the V-stem, that is, provides the vital non-logical content for it. I will consider the actual details of this process below.

10. Generalized lexical integers

According to É. Kiss' (1981) original hypothesis, the propositional part of a Hungarian sentence is "flat":
everything is a sister to V and is thus equally "close to", or "distant from" V. Komlósy and Ackerman (1983) and Ackerman (1984) provide ample evidence for the existence of a V-bar node, however, as was mentioned in 4.1. I cannot review their arguments in detail here, so let me just spell out the relevant consequences. 6

V-bar may be non-branching (49a) or branching (49b). In the latter case it dominates a verbal modifier in addition to the V-stem. The same V-stem may or may not occur in both configurations, with or without a change in lexical meaning.

(49)a. 

V-bar may be non-branching (49a) or branching (49b). In the latter case it dominates a verbal modifier in addition to the V-stem. The same V-stem may or may not occur in both configurations, with or without a change in lexical meaning.
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V-bar may be non-branching (49a) or branching (49b). In the latter case it dominates a verbal modifier in addition to the V-stem. The same V-stem may or may not occur in both configurations, with or without a change in lexical meaning.

V-bar may be non-branching (49a) or branching (49b). In the latter case it dominates a verbal modifier in addition to the V-stem. The same V-stem may or may not occur in both configurations, with or without a change in lexical meaning.
Ackerman and Komlósy also mention incorporated arguments as one type of VM; such V-bars have not yet been analyzed in detail, however. I will not develop a general account of argument incorporation here, either, but will pay sufficient attention to incorporation cases forced by the emptiness of the V-stem.

Remember that in view of (46) the items occurring in the VM position of (50a,b), for instance, cannot be Arguments:

(50)a. [\text{\textit{V}}} [\text{\textit{VM}} level-ek-Ø \text{\textit{I}}} \text{\textit{érkez-t-ek}} ]
letter-pl-nom arrive-past-3pl

b. [\text{\textit{V}}} [\text{\textit{VM}} level-ek-et \text{\textit{I}}} \text{\textit{kap-t-am}} ]
letter-pl-acc get-past-lsg

Nevertheless, the \(\Theta\)-criterion uses, rather than defines the notion Argument. Therefore we need some independent support for the above claim concerning the status of VMs. The notion Argument does not have a very sophisticated definition in Chomsky (1981); we get the following clues:

(51)a. Thus, we understand NP arguments to be NPs with some sort of "referential function," including names, variables, anaphors, pronouns; but not idiom chunks or elements inserted to occupy an obligatory position of syntactic structure. (35)

b. We can bring subcategorization and \(\Theta\)-marking together more closely by inventing a new \(\Theta\)-role, call it \#, for non-arguments that are subcategorized by heads, e.g., \textit{advantage} in "take advantage of." ... We may now read, e.g., \textit{advantage} as a kind of argument, call it a quasi-argument. (37)

Admitting that our VMs are surely not expletives, it may be more reassuring to assimilate them to idiom chunks with the unspecified \(\Theta\)-role \#. As far as pretheoretical intuition may go, for an empty verb to assign \# is as good as not to assign any \(\Theta\)-role whatsoever. Note, however, the following less pretheoretical points.

It is not entirely obvious whether subcategorization and \(\Theta\)-marking are to be brought closely together indeed. First,
even if we allow for there to be subcategorized positions that are not θ-marked, the θ-criterion suffices to exclude all unquestionably bad moves (see also Williams (1983)).

Second, calling quasi-arguments a kind of argument is but a manner of speaking, given that the quasi-θ-role is not on a par with true θ-roles. For instance, idiom chunks do not tend to undergo WH-movement or control PRO, and their potential to be antecedents of overt pronouns is dubious. This suggests we might divorce subcategorization from θ-marking on the one hand, and get rid of the quasi-θ-role on the other. This simplification will allow us to associate the lack of θ-marking with the Lexical Integrity Hypothesis. Roughly, the idea is as follows:

(52) Lexical integers can be θ-role assignors but no θ-role assignment takes place, or even needs to take place, within them.

That is, even if the NP part of an idiom may qualify as an Argument (which is not inconceivable if it is taken in its literal sense, e.g. glance in shoot a glance at), it is happy without a θ-role as long as it does not need to act as a θ-role bearer in relation to something external to the idiom. Given that a chain without any θ-role suffices for NP-movement, Raising and Passive are in principle predicted to be grammatical for idiom chunks. PRO, however, needs a controller with a θ-role, and an operator must bind a variable with a θ-role, so control and WH-movement are in principle out. (The WH-movement case is in fact much more complicated, cf. Relativization, but I will not go into details with this here.)

Remember, though, that all this is meant to facilitate the treatment of DE-sentences in Hungarian, so let us get back to (50). Those V-bars are certainly not idioms: both the nominal part and the verbal part are taken from open classes, and neither of them is taken in a non-literal sense (compare with shoot in shoot a glance at). Nevertheless, we have seen that V-bar is the natural θ-role assigning unit in Hungarian, and in this respect it is like a lexical integer.
So let us examine the other aspect of the analogy. Entirely independently of idioms, I suggested that an "empty" verb does not assign a specific \( \theta \)-role on the one hand, and that it must be substantiated on the other. In a theory like Zubizarreta's (1982), the natural substantiator is a \( \theta \)-role assigner. Notice, however, that in the mean time I have done away with the quasi-\( \theta \)-role, and dissociated subcategorization from \( \theta \)-marking. Now (46) can be strengthened to saying that an "empty" verb does not assign any \( \theta \)-role, and (47) can be satisfied by an "empty verb" if it takes a subcategorized argument as a substantiator. Therefore, both the V-bars in (49b) and those in (50) turn out to be like lexical integers in the sense that they are \( \theta \)-role assigners but no \( \theta \)-role assignment takes place within them. Note, however, that (52) also says that no \( \theta \)-role assignment even needs to take place in a lexical integer. This clause is vacuously true of (49b) but is relevant, and problematic, for (50).

Notice that (52) does not in fact make any reference to that property of lexical integers that they are explicitly listed in the lexicon. This is not accidental. My intention is to make the fixed character of "words" or "idioms" a special case, and to emphasize the properties they crucially share with more or less freely formed combinations. It appears, however, that this fixed character may not go quite unmentioned. As a first approximation, let me suggest the following notion of a generalized lexical integer:

\begin{equation}
\text{(53) Whenever a phrase acts as a \( \theta \)-role assigner but no \( \theta \)-role assignment takes place within it, it counts as a generalized lexical integer either (i) in virtue of being explicitly listed in the lexicon, or (ii) in virtue of the absence of any (obligatory) Argument from it.}
\end{equation}

(53ii) intends to constrain the occurrence of items belonging to \( \theta \)-role bearing categories in generalized lexical integers. For instance, it entails an NP may occur in a non-listed integer if and only if its Argumenthood can be questioned on independent grounds.
Let me now show my cards, risking that in this way it becomes obvious that I made the wrong empirical and/or theoretical generalization. Chomsky (1981) takes the criterial ingredient of Argumenthood to be referentiality. Let me assume, roughly, that definites are unquestionable Arguments, while indefinites are not. (This idea is similar to Safir’s (1982), who exploits the “non-referentiality” of indefinites in connection with exemption from the Binding Conditions.) In view of (53), this implies that an NP like the bucket may only occur in real idioms that are listed in the lexicon, whereas indefinites like a glance are free to occur in non-listed generalized lexical integers as well. (It appears this approach also puts the problem of bound variable idioms like lose one’s way and hit in the face in the right research perspective.)

To conclude this section: it looks like V-bars containing a DE-verb plus its incorporated argument are fully legitimate generalized lexical integers.

11. Wandering parts of integers

Note that earlier in this paper I insisted that DE-verbs are empty whenever their designated argument must be indefinite — that is, not only when this argument is incorporated, as was the case in (50). Therefore, substantiation must be possible even if an item that could appear within V-bar does not appear there:

(54) Érkezett tegnap levél.  
arrived yesterday letter

and even if the sentence contains no item that is small enough to ever be incorporated:

(55) Érkezett tegnap két vagy három levél.  
arrived yesterday two or three letter

Descriptively speaking, the fact that the potential VM in (54) appears outside V-bar is not surprising. It is true of all VMs that they can turn up anywhere in the sentence. This is one reason why É. Kiss (1981) generated them behind the
verb, on a par with Xmax's, despite her awareness of their particularly close relatedness to V. Now, if we have good reasons to believe that Hungarian has a V-bar node both in the lexicon and in syntax, we have to assume VMs may leave V-bar. The structure of (54) may thus be as follows:  

(56) $[S[V \, e_1 \, \text{érkezett} \, J \, \text{tegnap} \, \text{level}_1]$

Theoretically speaking, the fact that the potential VM appears outside V-bar is not surprising only if we may claim it is in a non-thematic position in S: only in that case can it constitute a chain with the empty category in V-bar. The existence of such a chain is obviously vital for the empty verb: in view of (47), it needs non-logical content. Furthermore, if level turns out to be an Argument, its survival is also dependent on the existence of such a chain: in view of (46), it cannot receive a θ-role from the empty verb / V-bar.

Fortunately, the need to postulate non-θ positions in S is not specific for this construction. In Szabolcsi (1981, 1983b), I showed that when the possessor leaves NP-bar through KOMP, it first lands among Xmax's behind the verb. This implies there must be non-θ positions available under S, or adjoined to S.

Now, if the formation of a chain reaching into V-bar is possible with items that are potential VMs, then (57) must also be possible in general:

(57) $[S[V \, e_1 \, X_1 \, \ldots \, V \, \ldots \ldots]$

That is, X need not be small enough for incorporation. If it is categorically and semantically appropriate for V, it can be linked to e and can substantiate V. Sort of independently of the general picture my wishful thoughts about which have been sketched in the previous section, in the case of DE-verbs we are considering, the simplest assumption is that the right syntactic category is NP, and the appropriate semantic property is just indefiniteness in the sense of Section 7. Thus (58) can be the structure of (55):

(58) $[S[V \, e_1 \, \text{érkezett} \, J \, \ldots \, \text{két vagy három} \, \text{level}_1]$

On the other hand, suppose X is a definite NP. In that case linking is impossible and V-bar ends up without any ability to assign θ-roles. A definite NP is undoubtedly an Argument but now it is not part of a word and cannot receive a θ-role in situ, either. Hence (59) is out, alongside with (60), where the subject Péter can also be assumed to be without a θ-role:

(59)* \[ S \{ \begin{array}{c} V \\ \text{érkezett} \\ \text{a levél} \end{array} \} \]
\[ \text{arrived} \quad \text{the letter} \]

(60)* \[ S \{ \begin{array}{c} V \\ \text{kapta} \\ \text{a levelet Péter} \end{array} \} \]
\[ \text{got} \quad \text{the letter-acc Péter} \]

Pseudo-verbs of 8.1, emerging from highlighting plus obliteration of the perfective/imperfective distinction may count as normal verb stems that appear under a non-branching V-bar, which is now capable of assigning a θ-role to its sisters:

(61)a. \[ S \{ \begin{array}{c} \text{tengnap} \\ V \\ \text{érkezett} \\ \text{a levél} \end{array} \} \]
\[ \text{yesterday} \quad \text{arrived} \quad \text{letter} \]

b. \[ S \{ \begin{array}{c} \text{tengnap} \\ V \\ \text{érkezett} \\ \text{a levél} \end{array} \} \]
\[ \text{yesterday} \quad \text{arrived} \quad \text{the letter} \]

As noted in Section 8, this latter option is not available to van 'be', because it is hopelessly empty of a PARTICULAR FASHION component. Thus, whether or not there is something in Focus, its designated argument must be linked to \( S \) under V-bar to substantiate it:

(62)a. \[ S \{ \begin{array}{c} V \\ \text{e_j volt} \\ \text{tengnap} \\ \text{level_j} \end{array} \} \]
\[ \text{was} \quad \text{yesterday} \quad \text{letter} \]

b. \[ S \{ \begin{array}{c} V \\ \text{e_j volt} \\ \text{level_j} \end{array} \} \]
\[ \text{yesterday} \quad \text{was} \quad \text{letter} \]

c. \[ S \{ \begin{array}{c} V \\ \text{e volt} \\ \text{level} \end{array} \} \]
\[ \text{yesterday} \quad \text{was} \quad \text{the letter} \]

With this, we have covered all the cases that have been claimed to be relevant in previous sections.

Now notice that while I have not yet clearly taken sides with the Argument or non-Argument status of indefinites in general, these analyses imply that sometimes it is an
Argument, and sometimes it is not. Crucially, indefinites have to be non-Arguments when they occur within, or are linked to an empty category within, V-bar, cf. (50), (56), (58), and (62a,b); and they have to be Arguments when they appear on their own in S, cf. (61). Obviously, these claims must be justifiable independently of the needs of the treatment of DE-phenomena. Now, one rather unambiguous test may be to check whether these indefinites behave as Œ-role bearers in relation adjunct-predicates.

Remember that Zubizarreta's adjuncts may assign a Œ-role, and if they do, it must combine with an Argument-Œ-role in LP. (That is, in this respect they are like sentences with a PRO subject that needs a controller.) The adjuncts I will use for the purposes of testing are called state-adverbials in the Hungarian grammatical tradition. They are formed from adjectives by adding the suffix an/en, do not occur in the VJI position, and can be "controlled" by nominatives or accusatives. The prediction is that whenever the nominative or accusative must be indefinite, it cannot "control" a state-adverbial; however, when it alternates with definites, it can "control" it. This prediction is borne out without exception:

\((50'\text{a})\) 
\[s \in [V \text{ letters-nom arrived crumpled}]\]
\[s \in [V \text{ letters-acc got-I crumpled}]\]

\((56'\text{a})\) 
\[s \in [V \text{ érkezett yesterday letter crumpled}]\]

\((58'\text{a})\) 
\[s \in [V \text{ ... 2 vagy 3 letter crumpled}]\]

\((62'\text{a})\) 
\[s \in [V \text{ volt] yesterday letter crumpled}]\]

In contrast, \textit{levél} is surely indefinite in (61a), too, but here its indefiniteness is not a property required by the
verb; the addition of a state-adverbial is grammatical; compare also (63):

(61')a. \[S \text{tegnap} \quad S \text{úgyérkezett} \quad e_1 \text{level györottent}]\]
yesterday arrived letter crumpled

b. \[S \text{tegnap} \quad S \text{úgyérk} \quad e_1 \text{a levlögyörottent}]\]
yesterday arr. the letter crumpled

(63) \[S \text{megérkezett} \quad P\text{éter betegen} \quad\]
arrived Peter sick

'Peter arrived and was in a sick state'

12. Loose ends

Although this paper can hardly be interpreted to provide either exhaustive or final answers to questions of the DE, it may be correct to single out two important issues to be taken up in subsequent work.

First, my attitude towards the relationship between DE-phenomena in Hungarian and in other languages needs to be disambiguated. Apart from the canonical subject problem, this involves the "control" properties and extractability of DE-arguments.

Second, I only outlined half of the answer to problem (28) by referring to de Jong and Verkuyl's (1984) work. It is to be emphasized that while these authors manage to ascribe distinct semantic properties to definites and indefinites, they also reproduce the correlation with the presence or absence of a syntactic determiner. It appears their argument can be rephrased in GB terms by saying that indefinites are "surface structure non-maximal projections". The syntactic contrast between definite and indefinite possessives in Hungarian, described in detail in Szabolcsi (1981), seems to provide striking support for this claim, and offers a chance to relate the dubious Argumenthood of indefinites to their internal syntactic structure.
Footnotes

* I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Farrell Ackerman for almost daily discussions during the past year. Although originally concerned with issues as different as separable verbal prefixes (within LFG) and definite versus indefinite possessives (within GB/MG), at a certain point we could not help noticing we were trying to put together pieces of the same puzzle. I also wish to thank the participants of the 6th Groningen Grammar Talks as well as M. Bródy and J. Harlig for very helpful comments on my draft 'On the syntax (?), or semantics (?), of the definiteness effect in Hungarian'.

1. No verb meaning 'have' occurs in the list. In Szabolcsi (1981) I argued that Hungarian HAVE-sentences contain the existential verb van with an indefinite possessive:

   (i) Mari-nak van-nak \[\widehat{\text{NP }} \hat{i}_1 \text{NP} \hat{i}_1 \text{ könyv-e-i-0-0 } \]
   Mary-dat be-3pl book-poss-pl-3sg-nom
   'Mary has books'

   (ii) Van-nak \[\text{NP} \hat{i}_1 \text{NP} \hat{i}_2 \text{ könyv-e-i-0-0 } \]
        be-3pl book-poss-pl-3sg-nom
   'He/she/it has books'

Definite possessives may contain an article, and the possessor may also surface within NP-bar (in subject or in K0I.P). It had been my intention to devote a section to the significance of this contrast, but for space reasons it seemed reasonable to omit it. Hence the jump from (1) to (10) in the numbering.

2. In the draft version I assumed kap and its brothers can become real verbs after highlighting. The untenability of this claim was pointed out to me by J. Harlig, in the context of his own research on aspect in Hungarian.


4. The situation is exactly the same with proper names, so the ambiguity may not be due to planned soup versus cooked soup.

5. The ungrammaticality of (40b) was noted by A. Komlósy.
In my earlier work on Focus, e.g. Szabolcsi (1983b), I collapsed these two kinds of contrast because, not being aware of any evidence to the contrary, I assumed that csak 'only' merely adds the implicature that the non-Focus version of the sentence is true.

6. Horvath (1981) also postulates a V-bar in Hungarian. Nevertheless, the properties she attributes to V-bar are so substantially different from those argued for by Ackerman and Komlósy that the two proposals can hardly be taken to be variants of each other.

7. É. Kiss moves VMs (her reduced complements) to Focus in the default case.

8. Remember that in the case of truly lexical V-bars this process presupposes Bracket Retention.

References


Ackerman (1984a), Verbal modifiers as argument-taking predicates: complex verbs in Hungarian. This volume.


Bresnan, ed. (1982), The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations. MIT Press.

Carlson (1978), Reference to Kinds in English. IULC.

Chomsky (1981), Lectures on Government and Binding. Foris.


É. Kiss (1981), Structural relations in Hungarian, a "free" word order language. Linguistic Inquiry 12.
É. Kiss (1984), Chapters of a Hungarian Generative Syntax. Manuscript (Reidel).
Kiefer (1984), Focus and modality. This volume.
Komlósy and Ackerman (1983), Some steps toward an understanding of Hungarian word order. Manuscript.
Vilsark (1977), Toward an explanation of certain peculiarities of the existential construction in English. Linguistic Analysis 3.
Partee (1983), Genitives. Talk, Univ. of Amsterdam.
Pesetsky (1982), Paths and Categories. PhD dissertation, MIT.
Safir (1982), Syntactic Chains and the Definiteness Effect. PhD dissertation, MIT.
Szabolcsi (1983b), Focussing properties, or the trap of first order. Theoretical Linguistics 10.
Szabolcsi (1983c), The possessor that ran away from home. To appear in The Linguistic Review.