

University of Groningen

Assymetries in Hungarian = Assymetrieën in het Hongaars

Marácz, László Károly

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

1989

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Marácz, L. K. (1989). *Assymetries in Hungarian = Assymetrieën in het Hongaars*. s.n.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Summary

Asymmetries in Hungarian

The purpose of this study is to defend the thesis that Hungarian is a *configurational* language. This thesis is studied here within the Government and Binding framework as put forward in Chomsky (1981; and subsequent literature). It is empirically motivated by the investigation of a number of unrelated syntactic phenomena. This leads to the conclusion that Hungarian is an *SOV*-language. Therefore, it is incorrect to assign the Hungarian clause a non-configurational "flat" structure, as for example in É. Kiss (1987a).

Chapter one is an introduction to this study. It reviews the modules of *UG* and how they interact with the syntax of Hungarian.

Chapter two discusses the configurationality issue in general and with respect to Hungarian in particular. It has been argued, for example in Hale (1981), that the so-called non-configurational languages are characterized by the absence of a VP. É. Kiss (1981a; and subsequent articles) has claimed that the Hungarian sentential clause is non-configurational as well, because it exhibits free word order and subject-object symmetries. It is concluded here that from a theoretical point of view it is unwanted to set "deep" parameters, like Configurationality Parameters. Moreover, such parameters make empirically false predictions. All languages which have been claimed to be non-configurational display *subject-object asymmetries*. This is also the case in *Hungarian*.

Chapter three elaborates the *phrase structure* of Hungarian. It appears that word order is less free than traditionally has been assumed. Hungarian has a basic *SOV*-order. Furthermore, some implications of other hypotheses with respect to its phrase structure are examined involving *V-movement*, 'weak' inflection, and *free recursion of CP*.

Chapter four discusses some properties of the *lexicon* in Hungarian. It is argued here that the syntactic representation of predicative items, the *LS*, is asymmetric, just as in other languages. Therefore, the absence of syntactically induced transitivity alternations cannot be an argument for the claim that there is no structural subject-predicate partitioning of the sentence. A parametrization of principles which relate Θ -roles

and syntactic structure is proposed to account for some differences between English and Hungarian concerning transitivity alternations.

Chapter five demonstrates that the *Projection Principle* is operative in Hungarian as well. This principle guarantees that the mapping between LS and syntax is one-to-one. For each lexical argument there is exactly one syntactic constituent present. Some phenomena are apparently in conflict with this hypothesis like the dropping of pronouns or split constituents. The former is, however, an instance of *pro-drop*, and the latter is covered by a theory of predication.

Chapter six discusses the problem of the parallel occurrence of clusters of *subject-object symmetries* and *subject-object asymmetries* in Hungarian. These clusters appear to be heterogeneous in the sense that they are distributed over the different modules of the grammar. Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that they must both be subsumed by a theory of UG. The subject-object asymmetries are derived from the structure which is generated by the categorial component of the grammar. The presence of this cluster supports the claim that the phrase structure of Hungarian is strictly *hierarchically* organised. The subject-object symmetries, on the other hand, do not form a counterexample to the VP-hypothesis, because they occur in uncontroversial configurational languages as well. After reduction of this cluster, only a residue of the Configurability Parameter remains.

Chapter seven examines *long Wh/Focus-movement* in Hungarian. It appears that it is a strictly *local* phenomenon which applies successive cyclicly. This is also the case with an alternative strategy of overt long Wh-movement, the so-called *mit*-strategy. With this strategy, the real Wh-phrase does not appear in the position of its scope but it remains in the Focus position of its clausal domain. Its scope position is marked by a dummy Wh-phrase *mit* 'what-ACC'. In multiple embedded Wh-questions, a repetition of *mit* occurs in each clausal domain making the locality effect visible. Furthermore, the properties of this phenomenon support hypotheses involving the structure of CP, the Projection Principle, the VP-hypothesis, trace theory, and the *Correspondence Hypothesis*. This latter principle states that the grammar of scope obeys the same conditions on government and bounding as the grammar of Wh-traces. As a consequence, a separate level for the representation of scope, like LF, is superfluous.

Chapter eight investigates the *PP* in Hungarian. Some postpositions may be inflected for person-number agreement (AGR) when they select a pronominal complement. By comparing inflected PPs, non-inflected PPs and possessive NPs (which contain AGR as well), we can isolate its properties. AGR in Hungarian has no phrase-structural prominence, it is *agreement* in traditional sense. This supports the hypothesis that this morpheme is weak in Hungarian. Furthermore, it may identify a *pro*-complement. Hence, Hungarian is *pro-drop* in inflected PPs and NPs as well. Finally, the fact that PPs and NPs are *head-final* provides empirical evidence for the SOV-hypothesis of Hungarian.

The concluding chapter argues why claims made by studies taking the *Hungarian-as-a-different-language-doctrine* as a point of departure are implausible. Furthermore, it lists the most important results of this study. These results originate from the view that *the idea of an abstract and fairly uniform underlying structure across languages* offers a fruitful paradigm for the research of languages.