

DOI: 10.2478/v10122-011-0002-9

DOES THE GENITIVE OPERATE IN THE HUNGARIAN CASE SYSTEM?

II. THE \emptyset -/*nak*-/*nek*-GENITIVE

ROBERT BIELECKI

ABSTRACT: Robert Bielecki. *Does the Genitive Operate in the Hungarian Case System? II. The \emptyset -/*nak*-/*nek*-Genitive*. Lingua Posnaniensis, vol. LIII (1)/2011. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences. PL ISSN 0079-4740, ISBN 978-83-7654-140-2, pp. 25–40.

The present paper should be regarded as a direct continuation of the article *Does the Genitive Operate in the Hungarian Case System? I. The \acute{e} -Genitive*. The core of the adopted approach represents the standpoint that present-day Hungarian cannot be conceived as a language exempt from any case syncretism. The possibility of distinguishing different case categories relevant for this language by referring only to the form of their markers (endings) is illusory. What is more, it creates a space where some phenomena remain imperceptible. The postulated attributive genitive category can be distinguished not only on the basis of its syntactic properties. The manifestations of this case also differ substantially from the manifestations of other recognized cases. It is difficult to regard the attributive genitive in Hungarian as syncretic with nominative or dative in the sense known in general linguistics, because the appropriate markers turn out to be insufficient in semifying (marking grammatically) the required meaning. They must be complemented by other markers attached to the head of the attributive syntagm (*a diák/ \emptyset könyv/e*, *a diák/nak a könyv/e* ‘the student’s book’). The properties of the distribution of the Hungarian attributive genitive with its two main manifestations (the endingless one: *a diák könyv/e*, and with ending: *a diáknak a könyv/e*) can be regarded as a contribution to the general theory of syntax; the genitive attributes of different grades are marked there substantially (*a diák/ \emptyset (III) könyv/e* (II) *cím/é/nek* (I) *a fordítás/a* ‘the translation of the title (I) of the book (II) of the student (III)’) and not only by their linear order as in many Indo-European and Finno-Ugric languages. When the word fulfilling the attributive function belongs to the category of personal pronoun, concord can be identified between it and its head in person and number (*az én könyv/em* ‘my book, the book of mine’). The factual elision of personal pronouns resulting from their redundancy in this context gives no grounds to state that morphemes like *-em* in *a könyv/em* do not fulfil any syntagmatic function. Such an utterance constitutes a discrepancy with the analogous behaviour of personal pronouns in relation to finite verbal forms (*én olvas/ok* ‘I read’ → *olvas/ok* ‘(I) read’) where no-one speaks of the irrelevancy of the personal endings in reference to their syntagmatic function. The necessity of distinguishing of so-called “marks” (here “possessor marks”) is being questioned here; those morphemes are not deprived of fulfilling the syntagmatic function ascribed traditionally to the case endings in the case of nominal flexion. They are regarded here as parts of the discontinuative (genitive) case markers. The specific features of the Hungarian genitive include its sharp division into two subcategories: (i) the \acute{e} -genitive and (ii) the \emptyset -/*nak*-/*nek*-genitive. Their complementary distribution, together with other discussed properties, additionally corroborates the relevance of distinguishing for them a common upper morphosyntactic category called the genitive case. And finally, Hungarian turns out to be a language where the accumulation of multiple case meanings, all being manifested substantially within the boundaries of one word, can be attested (*a diák/om/é/é/t* ‘the one of the one of my student’).

Robert Bielecki, Institute of Linguistics, Adam Mickiewicz University, al. Niepodległości 4, PL – 61-874 Poznań

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

As was discussed in the previous article, which presented among other things the development of the general attitude to the category of case in the hitherto existing Hungarian linguistic tradition, the *é*-morpheme was removed from the markers of the genitive case probably for the first time at the beginning of the 19th century by Verseggy (BIELECKI 2010: 11–12). In order to establish for Hungarian more suitable equivalents for the Latin genitive case (markers), he drew attention to the endings *-nak/-nek*, which had been previously recognized as the endings of the dative case. Verseggy argued, however, that the contexts where the genitive-dative homonymy resulting from his approach underlies dissolution are quite easy to delineate; (i) the dative case forms fulfil the function of the indirect object (or recipient adverbial phrase), whereas (ii) the genitive case forms fulfil the function of the attribute – transposing his words somewhat to the needs of modern linguistic terminology (ARTOWICZ 2003: 317–318). As a legacy of Verseggy’s linguistic output, at the end of the 19th century there began a long-lasting dispute between two opposing groups: the followers of the genitive and dative case options (SZABOLCSI 1991). In modern times the genitive in Hungarian linguistics seems to have fallen into disgrace. Antal, for example, referring to the phonic indistinguishability of the dative and (postulated) genitive case markers affirms that in Hungarian it is possible to talk only about two meanings (dativity and genitivity) which appear in the form of one case (dative). In his view, had Hungarian been the only language in the world, nobody would have struck upon the idea of such differentiation (ANTAL 2005: 279–280). Pete, on the other hand, reproaches the majority of today’s Hungarian linguists that they are not able even to imagine homonymic endings (and consequently cases) in their own language. He finds dogmatic the approach according to which the manifestation of case must be a form compulsorily governed by verbs. In order to satisfy this dogma the Hungarian genitive has been “sacrificed” in spite of its: (i) clearly characteristic semantic meaning(s), (ii) different syntactic surroundings, and (iii) summarily different forms from other cases; in his view it occurs in two variants which can be conceived as syncretic not only with: (i) the dative (*a diáknak a könyve* ‘the student’s book’) but also with (ii) the nominative (*a diák könyve* ‘the student’s book’) (PETE 2003: 310–311). Strangely enough the complexity not only of these facts, mentioned only by way of an introduction, but also many others which will be the subject of further discussion, in spite of their undoubted relationship with the category of case, seems to have aroused relatively insignificant interest among the majority of Hungarian linguists, limited rather to superficial declarations than to profound introspection.

2. THE \emptyset -/*nak/-nek*-GENITIVE

As has already been signalled by way of introduction in the previous article, the syncretism in Hungarian between the (postulated) attributive genitive on the one side and nominative and dative on the other, which deters the majority of linguists from distinguishing a genitive case for this language, seems to be of a quite different nature than is ordinarily referred to. In order to achieve the required meaning it is not enough to supply words fulfilling the attributive function with the appropriate morphemes (\emptyset or *-nak/-nek*). The mentioned

suffixes turn out to be semificatively insufficient in this function because they have to be obligatorily complemented by appropriate (so-called) possessor marks (*birtokos jelek*) attached to the word fulfilling the function of the head of the attributive syntagm:

- (1) *a* *diák/Ø* *könyv/e/Ø*
the (Def Artic) *student/Sg-Gen (attrib^I)* *book-Gen (attrib^{II}) Sg-Nom*
- (2) *a* *diák/nak* *a* *könyv/e/Ø*
the (Def Artic) *student/Sg-Gen (attrib^I)* *the* (Def Artic) *book-Gen (attrib^{II}) Sg-Nom*
 ‘the student’s book’

As is seen from the glosses, the marker of the attributive genitive in Hungarian can and should be thus regarded, in the light of the sketched dependencies, as a discontinuative morpheme dispersed in two words: (i) the word fulfilling the attributive function (denoting roughly speaking the possessor, called *birtokos jelző* ‘possessor attribute’ in the Hungarian linguistic literature) (Gen (attrib^I): (1) *diák/Ø*, (2) *diák/nak* ‘student’s’) and (ii) the word fulfilling the function of the head of this kind of attributive syntagm (denoting roughly speaking the possessum, called *birtok* ‘possessum’) (Gen (attrib^{II}): (1)–(2) *könyv/e* ‘(his) book’). The notion that morphological markers may be responsible for carrying the grammatical meaning of a word being attached to another word within the syntagm where both of them co-occur does not seem to constitute any kind of revolutionary solution in the framework of general linguistics; Blake for example in his treatise about the category of case refers to such a phenomenon as *head marking* (BLAKE 1997: 13–15). Similarly Bańczerowski in his general morphological word typology distinguishes among other things the dimension of ‘mood of semification’ which contains two quite opposite features: so-called (i) auto- and (ii) allosemification. The phenomenon of autosemification consists in semifying (expressing grammatically) the required meaning by a word relatively independently from other words, mainly by an affix attached to it which can be combined with an adposition or auxiliary word. Allosemification, *mutatis mutandis*, consists in semifying the appropriate meaning in a manner which is dependent on other words, mainly by means of zero morpheme arising from appropriate paradigmatic comparisons or other strategies such as word order or interference of semantics of whole phrases (BAŃCZEROWSKI 2008: 244–246). The way both morphological types of the postulated Hungarian attributive genitive are formally manifested, however, does not seem to fit univocally to any of the aforementioned features. They seem to constitute different intermediate stages between full auto- and allosemification. In the phrase (1) *a diák könyve* ‘the student’s book’ the word *diák* ‘student’s’ seems to express the required meaning allosemificatively, that is by making use of: (i) the zero morpheme, (ii) its rigid linear order with the word *könyve* ‘(his) book’ and (iii) the morpheme *-e* attached to *könyv-* ‘book-’. In Bańczerowski’s approach, however, affixation was foreseen only as one of the strategies of autosemification. The case of the phrase (2) *a diáknak a könyve* ‘the student’s book’ on the other hand is even more difficult to classify within the framework of Bańczerowski’s approach; the required meaning seems to be expressed both auto- (*diák/nak* ‘student’s’) and allosemificatively (*könyv/e* ‘(his) book’). In the light of the presented specificities of the Hungarian attributive genitive, it thus seems reasonable to complete Bańczerowski’s ‘mood of semification’ with the feature of auto-allosemification, which would allow us to cover the case of (2) *a diáknak a könyve*. Simultaneously the strategies

to which allosemification can resort should be extended to include the phenomenon of (al)lolexonal affixation, which would in turn cover the case of (1) *a diák könyve*.

In reference to the category of case in Hungarian linguistics there can be observed a certain inconsistency, as has already been signalled in my previous article concerning the issue of the genitive case. It is argued on the one hand that – contrary to the Latin case model – there is no case syncretism in Hungarian (compare however: SEBEOK 1946: 21–22). On the other hand, the modern Hungarian linguistic descriptive tradition teems with unclear notions which try to name specific Hungarian grammatical phenomena which are incompatible with those arising from the traditional Latin-Greek terminology. A very good example of such a discrepancy is the already discussed trichotomy of grammatical suffixes which are classified into: (i) *képzők* ‘word-forming suffixes’, (ii) *jelek* ‘marks’ and (iii) *ragok* ‘endings’. As far as the difference only between the word-forming suffixes (*képzők*) and endings (*ragok*) is concerned, from the general point of view there seems to be no obscurity at least from the mere terminological point of view (BIELECKI 2010: 12–14). The “marks” (*jelek*), however, constitute quite a challenge for readers not accustomed to such distinctions. It is argued for example that they are not able to express syntagmatic relations, in contrast to the endings (ANTAL 2005: 356, compare however: PAPP 1955: 293–294). In the present author’s view such an assertion is at least partially untrue, if not totally. Let us consider the following example:

(3)	<i>Lát/t/am</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>diák/Ø</i>	<i>könyv/é/t.</i>
	see-Praet-I Sg	the (Def	student/Sg-	book-Gen
	Activ Ind Objectiv	Artic)	Gen (attrib ¹)	(attrib ¹) Sg-Acc
	‘I saw the student’s book.’			

The morpheme *-e-* (here *-é-* because of the vicinity of *-t*) (rather univocally classified in modern Hungarian linguistics as a “mark”: *birtokos jel* ‘possessor mark’) attached to the stem *könyv-* ‘book-’ seems to be the only one which substantially binds it with the word *diák* ‘student’. Because of this fact the morpheme under discussion beyond any doubt fulfils a syntagmatic function. Its morphotactical position or connectivity with exponents of other casual meanings (here accusative (*-t*)) should, in the light of the presented dependencies, be considered a matter of secondary importance. The limitation of the case suffixes only to those which occupy the last morphotactical position (KIEFER 1987, 2000: 578, 584) seems to be – similarly to the necessity of distinguishing such morpheme class as “marks” – without motivation in the light of the considerations presented. I propose to classify them here as parts of the discontinuative (genitive) case markers which can co-occur within the boundaries of one Hungarian word.

2.1. THE LINEMATICS OF THE HUNGARIAN ATTRIBUTIVE GENITIVE

In order to present possibly the most exact and theoretically homogeneous picture of the postulated attributive genitive in Hungarian arising from the approach adopted in the present paper, its linear properties should now be investigated. In talking about the relevant phenomena, it seems desirable to avoid using on one hand such vague terms as (*birtokos jel* ‘(possessor) mark’ and on the other hand such eclectic terms as *birtokos jelző* ‘possessor attribute’ or *birtok* ‘possessum’ and certain others which are multiplied in Hungarian grammars. It is impossible to guess which of the linguistic aspects of the relevant phenomena

they are being used to describe; morphosyntactic, syntactic or semantic. If morphosyntactic, how can a word belonging (for example) to the nominative case fulfil any other syntactic function than the subject? Why in the morphosyntactic categorization are some of the highly relevant features (like homodeterminality – occurring in the same syntactic contexts) intentionally concealed, blocking the possibility of recognition of phonic neutralization of some other case (here genitive) in the form of nominative and dative simultaneously? Why cannot these three cases be regarded partially syncretic, if there are circumstances which would motivate such an approach? Is Hungarian really so exceptional that its description cannot contain at least tentatively any mention of probable case syncretism? And in turn: why should only one part of the substantial manifestation of the (genitive) case be regarded as its exponent, and the other removed automatically from the considerations about the category of case on the basis of the unconvincing claim that it belongs to the so-called *birtokos jelek* ‘possessor marks’, which are different, as it turns out, from the (recognized case) endings (*(eset)ragok*) only in terms of their morphotactical position and nothing else? If syntactic, why in the terms describing both members of the analysed syntagm type does only one of them contain any reference to the syntactic properties (*jelző* ‘attribute’), the other one being called simply, and in a non-binding way, *birtok* ‘possessum’? And finally, if semantic, why should only the possessive meaning be taken into account, if the words in question encode quite a wide range of different semantic meanings as well (compare: TOMPA 1968: 293–296). What is the basis for giving such a misleading privilege to this particular meaning while concealing others, for example agent or patient in nominalised phrases (*a diák olvasása* ‘the reading of the student’ (compare: genitivus subiectivus), *a könyv olvasása* ‘the reading of the book’ (genitivus obiectivus), or as in *becsület embere* ‘the man of the honour’ (genitivus qualitatis), *Budapest városa* ‘the city of Budapest’ (genitivus identitatis), *a diákok egyike* ‘the one of the students’ (genitivus partitivus) and even in the case of *a diák tette* ‘done by the student’ (genitivus auctoris)¹), etc. As far as the author is aware, the student or book cannot be classified semantically as possessor (*birtokos*) of reading, just as the man of his honour, Budapest of the city, the students of the one and so on.

When the linear order Gen (attrib^I) – Gen (attrib^{II}) in the direct vicinity (apart from the presence of definite articles) is taken into account, the Gen (attrib^I) can occur in both forms: (i) without ending ((1) *a diák könyve*) and (ii) with ending *-nak/-nek* ((2) *a diáknak a könyve*)². Should the vicinity in the discussed sense be not direct (like in (4)) or the linear order reversed (Gen (attrib^{II}) – Gen (attrib^I)) (like in (5)), only the *-nak/-nek* as the markers of Gen (attrib^I) seem to be admissible, for example:

¹ In the framework of the adopted approach there seems to be no reason to distinguish two kinds of passive past participle: (i) *melléknévi igenév* ‘adjectival participle’, for example *tett* ‘done’, and (ii) *igei igenév* ‘verbal participle’, for example (*a diák*) *tett(e)* ‘done (by the student)’, as is ordinarily done in Hungarian grammars. The second ((*a diák*) *tett(e)*) does not constitute any opposition in the sense given to it ordinarily to the first one (*tett*), what is more both types of participles represent only one participle in the form of *tett*. The form *tette* is provided with the ending of the Gen (attrib^{II}). Hence results the impossibility of removal of the word denoting agent from its vicinity and its obligatory occurrence with the participle, the ending *-e* of Gen (attrib^{II}) marking namely all-lexonally the case category to which *diák* belongs; without the word *diák* there is no need for the *-e* in *tette*, and *tette* returns to the form *tett*.

² With the exception of: (i) the interrogative pronouns *ki* ‘who’ or *mi* ‘what’ and (ii) the demonstrative pronouns *ez* ‘this’ or *az* ‘that’; *kinek a könyve* ‘whose book’, *ennek a diáknak a könyve* ‘this student’s book’ (KESZLER et al. 2000: 451).

- (4) *A diák/nak ez/t a könyv/é/t lát/t/am.*
the (Def student/Sg- this/Sg- the (Def book-Gen see-Praet-I Sg
Artic) Gen (attrib¹) Acc Artic) (attrib¹) Sg-Acc Activ Ind Objectiv
 ‘I saw this book of the student.’
- (5) *A könyv/é/t lát/t/am a diák/nak.*
the (Def book-Gen (attrib¹) see-Praet-I Sg the (Def student/Sg-Gen (attrib¹)
Artic) Sg-Acc Activ Ind Objectiv Artic)
 ‘I saw the student’s book.’

On the other hand, the endings *-nak/-nek* as markers of Gen (attrib¹) seem to be excluded in the position before a word already containing the endings *-nak/-nek*, be it the marker of another Gen (attrib¹) (phrases (6)–(7)) or dative case (phrase (8)):

- (6) *a diák/Ø könyv/é/nek a cím/e/Ø*
the (Def student/Sg- book-Gen (attrib¹) Sg- the (Def title-Gen (attrib¹) Sg-
Artic) Gen (attrib¹) Gen (attrib¹) Artic) Nom
 ‘the title of the student’s book’
- (7) *a diák/Ø könyv/e/Ø cím/é/nek a fordítás/a/Ø*
the (Def student/Sg- book-Gen title/Sg-Gen the (Def translation-Gen
Artic) Gen (attrib¹) (attrib¹) Sg- (attrib¹)-Gen Artic) (attrib¹) Sg-Nom
Gen (attrib¹) (attrib¹)
 ‘the translation of the title of the student’s book’
- (8) *Mond/t/am a diák/Ø ap/já/nak.*
tell-Praet-I Sg the (Def Artic) student/Sg- father-Gen (attrib¹) Sg-
Activ Ind Objectiv Gen (attrib¹) Dat
 ‘I told (it) to the student’s father.’

The stem *diák-* ‘student-’ in the examples (6)–(8) and *könyv(e)-* ‘(his) book-’ in (7) must assume the endingless form of Gen (attrib¹) because they appear before the word already containing the ending *-nak/-nek* (The phrases **a diáknak a könyvének a címe*, **a diák könyvének a címének a fordítása* and **Mondtam a diáknak az apjának* are regarded as incorrect.). In the light of the linear restrictions imposed on both types of Gen (attrib¹) the case of the phrases (6)–(7) seems to be especially instructive for the general theory of syntax; Hungarian seems to be a language in which the division of traditional parts of sentence into smaller sets of words than is ordinarily done according their determinational properties postulated by Bańczerowski referring to for example: (i) the genitive attribute and (ii) the genitive attribute of another genitive attribute(s) (the second (and further) grade attribute(s)) finds a substantial manifestation apart from in the word order (compare: BAŃCZEROWSKI 1980: 127). The genitive attribute of the genitive attribute in Hungarian can be manifested only by means of endingless Gen (attrib¹) (*a diák/Ø könyv/é/nek a cím/e*, *a diák/Ø könyv/e/Ø cím/é/nek a fordítás/a*). The first grade genitive attribute being already determined by another genitive attribute(s) can occur only in the form of Gen (attrib¹) with ending (*a diák/Ø könyv/é/nek a cím/e*, *a diák/Ø könyv/e/Ø cím/é/nek a fordítás/a*). Thus genitive attributes of the first grade on the one hand, and those of the second and third grade on the other, are in Hungarian

semically distinguishable; the first grade genitive attribute carries the ending *-nak/-nek* and the second and third grade genitive attribute(s) carry no ending. What is more, in the case of at least three genitive attributes the middle one(s) are differentiated from the last by means of the ending of Gen (attrib^{II}) (compare (7) *a diák* (III grade attribute) *könyv/e* (II grade attribute) *cím/é/nek* (I grade attribute) *a fordítása*). The described phenomenon seems to be unknown in such Indo-European and even other Finno-Ugric languages as:

English:	<i>the title of the student's book</i>	Russian:	<i>название книги студента</i>
German:	<i>der Titel des Buches des Studenten</i>	Polish:	<i>tytuł książki studenta</i>
Icelandic:	<i>titill bókar háskólanemans</i>	Lithuanian:	<i>studento knygos pavadinimas</i>
Latin:	<i>titulus libri discipuli</i>	Finnish:	<i>opiskelijan kirjan otsikko</i>
French:	<i>le titre du livre de l'étudiant</i>	Estonian:	<i>üliõpilase/Ø raamatu pealkiri</i>
Spanish:	<i>el título del libro del estudiante</i>		

Of course the bolded formal markers of the genitive case referring to the words meaning respectively *student* and *book* in the examples above are often different; affixial for Icelandic, Latin, Russian, Polish, Lithuanian, Finnish and Estonian, affixial-adpositional for English and German, and adpositional for French and Spanish. However their substantial form (independently from the strategy adopted in a language) does not seem to result from the grade of the genitive attribute whose function they fulfil, but from mainly lexical factors (for example belonging to different inflectional types) which can be regarded as irrelevant for the matter under discussion.

2.2. THE ATTRIBUTIVE GENITIVE AND PERSONAL MEANINGS

As has already been stated, the marker of the attributive genitive in Hungarian can be conceived as a discontinuative morpheme dispersed in two words; the word fulfilling the function of: (i) the attribute (Gen (attrib^I)) and (ii) its head (Gen (attrib^{II})), for example: (1) *a diák/Ø könyv/e*, (2) *a diák/nak a könyv/e*. Should the word fulfilling the attributive function belong to the category of personal pronoun, based on the appropriate paradigmatic comparisons the concord in number and person between the words building the analysed syntagm type can be stated:

(9)	<i>az</i>	<i>én/Ø</i>	<i>könyv/em/Ø</i>	(12)	<i>a</i>	<i>mi/Ø</i>	<i>könyv/ünk/Ø</i>
	<i>the</i>	<i>I/I Sg-</i>	<i>book/Sg-Gen</i>		<i>the</i>	<i>we/I Pl-</i>	<i>book/Sg-Gen</i>
	(Def	Gen (attrib ^I)	(attrib ^{II}) I Sg		(Def	Gen	(attrib ^{II}) I Pl
	Artic)		-Nom		Artic)	(attrib ^I)	-Nom
			‘my book, the book of mine’				‘our book, the book of ours’
(10)	<i>a</i>	<i>te/Ø</i>	<i>könyv/ed/Ø</i>	(13)	<i>a</i>	<i>ti/Ø</i>	<i>könyv/etek/Ø</i>
	<i>the</i>	<i>you/II Sg-</i>	<i>book/Sg-Gen</i>		<i>the</i>	<i>you/II Pl-</i>	<i>book/Sg-Gen</i>
	(Def	Gen (attrib ^I)	(attrib ^{II}) II Sg		(Def	Gen	(attrib ^{II}) II Pl
	Artic)		-Nom		Artic)	(attrib ^I)	-Nom
			‘your book, the book of yours’				‘your book, the book of yours’

(11)	<i>az</i>	ő/Ø	<i>könyv/e/Ø</i>		(14)	<i>az</i>	ő³/Ø	<i>könyv/ük/Ø</i>
	<i>the</i>	<i>he/III Sg-</i>	<i>book/Sg-Gen</i>			<i>the</i>	<i>he/III Sg-</i>	<i>book/Sg-Gen</i>
	(Def	Gen (attrib ¹)	(attrib ¹) III Sg			(Def	Gen	(attrib ¹) III Pl
	Artic)		-Nom			Artic)	(attrib ¹)	-Nom
	‘his book, the book of him’					‘their book, the book of theirs’		

The bolded morphemes attached to the word fulfilling the function of the head of the syntagm (*-em*, *-ed*, *-e*, *-ünk*, *-etek*, *-ük*) are known in modern Hungarian linguistic literature under, among others, the name of the already discussed *birtokos jelek* ‘possessor marks’, which is sometimes complemented with the word *személy-* ‘person/personal’ (*birtokos személyjelek*) in order to accentuate their variability in reference to the personal meanings. Needless to say, in the case of those morphemes it is stated that they are deprived of any syntagmatic function. This assumption, however, seems to be questionable. It is obvious that their forms allow one to recognize the grammatical person and number of the word fulfilling the attributive function without the need for its lexicalization, which in actual language use very often leads to its elision: Hungarians say more frequently (for example) *a könyvem* ‘my book, the book of mine’ instead of the redundant (from this point of the view) *az én könyvem*. The morpheme *-em* in *könyvem* refers, however, to *én* by means of its form and expresses the syntagmatic relation of the word *én* to the word *könyvem* (analogously the syntagmatic relation of *diák* to *könyve* in *a diák könyve* is expressed, amongst others, by the *-e* from *könyve*), when the appropriate syntagm should be saturated. If an analogous mode of thinking were applied for example to the personal forms of the Latin verb, we would have to state that the ending *-o* in *leg/o* ‘(I) read’ does not fulfil any syntagmatic function because, manifesting person and number unambiguously, the form *lego* can be treated as syntactically self-sufficient, which gives the impression that the lexicalization of *ego* ‘I’ is superfluous and hence fulfils only an auxiliary function. As far as the author is aware, no one has proposed such an approach to the personal endings of the Latin verb or any other language, including Hungarian itself. The analysed phenomenon in Hungarian manifests in this sense an obvious similarity to the omission of personal pronouns in the case of Latin personal verbs: *ego lego* → *lego*, *az én könyvem* → *a könyvem*. It is among the Hungarian specificities that the omission refers to the determiner (*én* determines syntactically *könyvem*) which “leaves” after the ellipsis the mark of the grammatical category of the case (person and number) to which it belonged on the head of the phrase (*könyvem*). In Latin, the ellipsis refers to the head of the phrase (*ego* ‘I’) which “leaves” the mark of the category of person and number to which it belonged on the determiner (*lego* ‘(I) read’).

The present author rejects the possibility of assigning words like *diák* (from (1) *a diák könyve*) and *én* (from (9) *az én könyvem*) to the nominative case because this morphosyntactic category should be limited only to words fulfilling the function of subject. As was discussed in the previous sections, the distribution of the endingless Gen (attrib¹) does not cover exactly the distribution of the Gen (attrib¹) with ending. For example, in the case of interrogative and demonstrative pronouns only the forms of the Gen (attrib¹) with ending seem to be acceptable (*kinek a könyve* ‘whose book’, *ennek a diáknak a könyve* ‘the book of this student’), on the

³ The concord in number in the analysed syntagm type is to some degree partial because it is not observed in reference to the third person plural (*az ő könyv/ük* literally: *‘their book of him’, the theoretically congruent phrase **az őök könyv/ük* literally: *‘their book of theirs’ is incorrect.).

other hand in dependency of the grade of the co-occurring attributes only the forms of the endless Gen (attrib^l) or Gen (attrib^l) with ending are allowed, and the like (compare phrases (4)–(8)). To the words occurring in the phrase type *az én könyvem* ‘my book, the book of mine’ is subordinated an analogous morphosyntactic categorization, as to those in the phrase type *a diák(nak a) könyve* ‘the student’s book’, because insisting on the nominativeness of the personal pronouns in the analysed syntagm type (which modern Hungarian grammars in fact do without exception) would be equivalent to ignoring without any motivation the syntactic and morphosyntactic similarity (to some degree indistinguishability) between those syntagm types.

In reference to the relationship between such grammatical meanings as: (i) genitivity, (ii) person and (iii) number which seem to be accumulated in Hungarian to some degree, as we have seen, within the boundaries of one morpheme⁴, it should be noticed that in the relevant syntagm type whose constituents belong to the category of third person it cannot be stated that there is redundancy in marking the meaning of the number, in contrast to the remaining persons (similarly in: É. KISS 2002: 170–172). As results from comparison of (11) *az ő könyve* ‘his book, the book of him’ and (14) *az ő könyvük* ‘their book, the book of theirs’, the plurality in (14) is marked only once by means of the ending *-ük* in *könyvük*. When the word fulfilling the attributive function belongs to the category of common noun, its plurality is marked only once as well, but on the word fulfilling the function of the attribute:⁵

(1) *a diák/Ø könyv/e/Ø*
the student/Sg book-Gen
 (Def -Gen (attrib^l)
 Artic) (attrib^l) Sg-Nom
 ‘the student’s book’

(15) *a diák/ok/Ø könyv/e/Ø*
the student- book-
 (Def Pl-Gen Gen
 Artic) (attrib^l) (attrib^l)
 Sg-Nom
 ‘the students’ book’

(2) *a diák/nak a könyv/e/Ø*
the student/ the book-
 (Def Sg-Gen (Def Gen
 Artic) (attrib^l) Artic) (attrib^l)
 Sg-Nom
 ‘the student’s book’

(16) *a diák/ok/nak a könyv/e/Ø*
the student- the book-
 (Def Pl-Gen (Def Gen
 Artic) (attrib^l) Artic) (attrib^l)
 Sg-Nom
 ‘the students’ book’

In all the examples above the word meaning ‘book’ remains in the same form (*könyve*) independently of the number of the word fulfilling the function of attribute: *a diák/Ø könyv/e*, *a diák/ok/Ø könyv/e*, *a diák/nak a könyv/e*, *a diák/ok/nak a könyv/e*. Compare however: (9) *az én könyvem* vs. (12) *a mi könyvünk* and (10) *a te könyved* vs. (13) *a ti könyvetek*.

2.3. THE Ø-/nak-/nek-GENITIVE AND THE DATIVE

Let us now consider some relevant aspects of the relatively complicated relations between the postulated attributive genitive and the (traditional) dative case in Hungarian. The

⁴ Melcsuk’s proposal to separate person and number markers can be viewed as motivated diachronically rather than synchronically (MELCSUK 1968: 176).

⁵ The concord in number: *a diák könyve* vs. **a diákok könyvük* (literally) **‘their book of the students’* survived in Hungarian only until the first half of the 19th century (BÁRCZI 1963: 334–335).

syncretism between one of the obligatory exponents of the genitive (Gen (attrib^l)) and the dative case seems to lead in some Hungarian sentence type(s) to total ambiguity, for example:

- (17) *Vissza/ad/t/am* *a* *diák/nak* *a* *könyv/é/t.*
- a) *re/turn-Praet-I Sg* *the (Def* *student/Sg-Gen* *the (Def* *book-Gen (attrib^{ll})*
Activ Ind Objectiv *Artic)* *(attrib^l)* *Artic)* *Sg-Acc*
 ‘I returned the student’s book.’
- b) *re/turn-Praet-I Sg* *the (Def* *student/Sg-Dat* *the (Def* *book-Gen (attrib^{ll})*
Activ Ind Objectiv *Artic)* *Artic)* *Sg-Acc*
 ‘I returned the student his book.’

As the glosses suggest, the word *diáknak* belongs simultaneously to the genitive (Gen (attrib^l)) (17a) and dative case (17b). In the sentence (17a) the word *diáknak* fulfils the function of attribute of the word *könyvét*, and its morphosyntactic and syntactic categorization would be the same as the analogous categorization in the sentence: (17’) *Visszaadtam a diák könyvét* ‘I returned the student’s book’, where the discussed homonymy between Gen (attrib^l) and Dat seems to be resolved beyond any doubt in favour of the attributive genitive. On the other hand, in the sentence (17b) the word *diáknak* fulfils the function of the indirect object (or recipient adverbial phrase) determining syntactically the predicate *visszaadtam* ‘I returned’, and its morphosyntactical and syntactical categorization would be the same as the analogous categorization in the sentence: (17’’) *Visszaadtam a diáknak a diák könyvét* ‘I returned the student the student’s book’, where the discussed homonymy between Gen (attrib^l) and Dat seems to be resolved beyond any doubt in favour of the dative case. Of course such homonymy (leading to ambiguity) applies to only some Hungarian words ending in *-nak/-nek*. In the case of the discussed sentences like (4) *A diáknak ezt a könyvét láttam* or (5) *A könyvét láttam a diáknak* and many more it seems to be nonexistent. Considerations regarding the attributive genitive marked with *-nak/-nek* which suggest its source in the dative case which resulted from the syntactic (and simultaneously morphosyntactic) reanalysis of the sentence type represented here by (17) (BÁRCZI 1963: 167, KORHONEN 1991: 167, KISS et al. 2005: 247–248), are relevant, however, only to the subject of diachronic dependencies, which in the present synchronic state of the Hungarian language have largely disappeared; only in some sentences can words ending in *-nak/-nek* be understood as ambiguous in reference to the category of case (genitive vs. dative). In a great number of sentences they clearly belong only to one of the discussed case categories: (i) the attributive genitive (Gen (attrib^l)) or (ii) the dative. In this aspect the Hungarian language provides some quite instructive data for the general theory of syntax; total syntactic homonymy – leading to ambiguity – does not seem to be excluded even if it is based on morphosyntactic categories which are never homophonic with each other. The following schema shows the possible allomorphs of the analysed cases morphemes:

Gen (attrib)		Dat
Gen (attrib ^l)	Gen (attrib ^{ll})	
-Ø	-a, -e, -ja, -je, -am, -om, -em, -öm, -ad, -od, -ed, -öd, ...	
<i>-nak, -nek</i>	<i>-a, -e, -ja, -je, ...</i>	<i>-nak, -nek</i>

present author's view, however, this slight difference is not the main reason for ascribing the word(s) *diáknak* from (18)–(19) and *diákoknak* from (20)–(21) to the dative case rather than the genitive. All the sentences (18)–(21) seem to represent an elliptic sentence type. The full structure to which, thanks to the appropriate morphemes, they refer would be built up in the following way: (18') *A diáknak van az ő saját könyve* 'The student has his own book', (19') *A diáknak vannak az ő saját könyvei* 'The student has his own books', (20') *A diákoknak van az ő saját könyvük* 'The students have their own books' (Each of them has one book.) and finally (21') *A diákoknak vannak az ő saját könyveik* 'The students have their own books'. Only the bolded words (*ő*) (which, because of the obvious redundancy, are often removed from such sentences in actual language use, compare (17'')) *Visszaadtam a diáknak a diák könyvét* can, in the light of the approach presented, belong to the genitive case. The words *diáknak*, *diákoknak* from (18)–(21) are not in this sense bound with words *könyve*, *könyvei*, *könyvük*, *könyveik*; they do not determine them syntactically indirectly, fulfilling the function of the attribute. In contrast to those belonging to Gen (attrib^l), they seem to be semificatively sufficient. It seems more convenient to recognize them as fulfilling the function of adverbial phrase, and hence belonging to the dative case, referring to the verb predicate *van/vannak* with the stipulation that they acquire in this context a possessive meaning (dativus possessivus) which is also characteristic of many uses of the genitive case. In spite of all this, in the majority of cases the appropriate (syntactic and morphosyntactic) context allows us to state if we are dealing with the genitive or dative case almost without any difficulties. Let us consider some examples which have already been discussed:

Gen (attrib)	Dat
(2) <i>a diáknak a könyve</i> (4) <i>A diáknak ezt a könyvét láttam.</i> (5) <i>A könyvét láttam a diáknak.</i> (6) <i>a diák könyvének a címe</i> (7) <i>a diák könyve címének a fordítása</i> (16) <i>a diákoknak a könyve</i>	(8) <i>Mondtam a diák apjának.</i> (17'') <i>Visszaadtam a diáknak a diák könyvét.</i> (18(')) <i>A diáknak van (az ő saját) könyve.</i> (19(')) <i>A diáknak vannak (az ő saját) könyvei.</i> (20(')) <i>A diákoknak van (az ő saját) könyvük.</i> (21(')) <i>A diákoknak vannak (az ő saját) könyveik.</i>
(17) <i>Visszaadtam a diáknak a könyvét.</i>	(17) <i>Visszaadtam a diáknak a könyvét.</i>

Needless to say, the independence of the attributive genitive from the dative case as defended in the present paper is additionally quite systematically maintained by the fact that the Gen (attrib^l) is also syncretic with nominative. The dative case, on the other hand, can never be regarded as syncretic with the nominative.

2.4. THE *é-* AND *Ø/-nak/-nek*-GENITIVE

As was mentioned in our previous article dedicated to the problem of the genitive case, the split of this morphosyntactic category into two subcategories in Hungarian is very conspicuous. Words with the endings *-Ø/-nak/-nek* on the one hand can fulfil only the attributive function. The head of such an attributive syntagm must be complemented with the to some degree auxiliary morphemes *-al/-el/-jal/-je* etc. because the markers *-Ø/-nak/-nek* in the required meaning seem to be semificatively insufficient. On the other hand, words with the

ending *-é* are deprived of the possibility of fulfilling the function of the attribute; they can be encountered exclusively in the predicative and elliptic function. To summarize:

genitive		
é-genitive		Ø-/nak-/nek-genitive
predicative	elliptic	attributive
(A könyv a diák/é.)	(A) diák/é/t (láttam).	(a) diák/Ø (könyv)/e (a) diák/nak (a könyv)/e
‘(The book) is (the) student’s.’	‘(I saw the) student’s one.’	‘(the) student’s (book)’

The present author takes the view that both analysed types of genitive should be grouped in one upper morphosyntactic category, on the same principle that speech sounds occurring in complementary distribution are being grouped under one phoneme if they do not contradict other postulates of homophonemicity (compare: BATÓG 1967: 93, BAŃCZEROWSKI 1980: 97–98).

It is a feature of Hungarian that the elision of the head in the analysed syntagm type leaves on the word hitherto fulfilling the attributive function its substantial trace in the form of the *é*-morpheme of the so-called elliptic genitive, for example: *a diák(nak a) könyve* → *a diáké*. The marker of the elliptic genitive thus obligatorily co-occurs in one word with the marker of another case, for example: *diák/é/t* ‘the student’s one’. What is more, the marker of the elliptic genitive can even be doubled, for example *diák/é/é/t* ‘the one of the one of the student’, which means that some Hungarian words can carry even three casual meanings simultaneously (BIELECKI 2010: 16–23, compare however: SANG-HYUP 1990: 50, 63). As it will now be seen, this is not yet the quantitative limit of case accumulation admissible within the boundaries of one Hungarian word. Let us consider the following chain of ellipsis:

- | | | | | | |
|------|---|--|--|---|---|
| (22) | <i>az</i> <i>én/Ø</i>
<i>the</i> I/I Sg-
(Def Gen
Artic) (attrib ^l) | <i>diák/om/Ø</i>
<i>student/Sg-Gen</i>
(attrib ^{ll}) I Sg-
Gen (attrib ^l) | <i>könyv/é/nek</i>
<i>book-Gen</i>
(attrib ^{ll}) Sg-
Gen (attrib ^l) | <i>a</i> <i>cím/e/Ø</i>
<i>the</i> title-Gen
(Def (attrib ^{ll})
Artic) Sg-Nom | ellipsis of:
<i>én</i>
(the attribute
of <i>diákom</i>)
→ |
| (23) | <i>a</i>
<i>the</i>
(Def
Artic) | <i>diák/om/Ø</i>
<i>student/Sg-Gen</i>
(attrib ^{ll}) I Sg-
Gen (attrib ^l) | <i>könyv/é/nek</i>
<i>book-Gen</i>
(attrib ^{ll}) Sg-
Gen (attrib ^l) | <i>a</i> <i>cím/e/Ø</i>
<i>the</i> title-Gen
(Def (attrib ^l)
Artic) Sg-Nom | ellipsis of:
<i>könyv</i>
(the head
of <i>diákom</i>)
→ |
| (24) | <i>a</i>
<i>the</i>
(Def
Artic) | <i>diák/om/é/nak</i>
<i>student/Sg-Gen</i>
(attrib ^{ll}) I Sg-
Gen (ellipt) Sg-
Gen (attrib ^l) | | <i>a</i> <i>cím/e/Ø</i>
<i>the</i> title-Gen
(Def (attrib ^{ll})
Artic) Sg-Nom | ellipsis of:
<i>cím</i>
(the head of
<i>diákoménak</i>)
→ |
- ‘the title of the book of my student (of mine)’
- ‘the title of the book of my student’
- ‘the title of the one of my student’

(25)	<i>a</i>	<i>diák/om/é/é/Ø</i>
	<i>the</i>	<i>student/Sg-Gen</i>
	(Def	(attrib ^{II}) I Sg-
	Artic)	Gen (ellipt) Sg-
		Gen (ellipt) Sg-
		Nom
	‘the one of the one of my student’	

The word *diákomée* in the phrase (25) seems to be provided with four case markers at the same time: (i) *-om-* (Gen (attrib^{II})), (ii) and (iii) *-é-* (elliptic genitive) and (iv) *-Ø* (nominative). Thus the genitive markers can accumulate threefold within the boundaries of one Hungarian word. The first position is occupied by one part of the discontinuative attributive genitive marker; the second (and third) position is (are) occupied by the elliptic genitive marker(s). The markers of the Gen (attrib^{II}), thanks to their relatively high degree of univocality due to concord in person and number between the words fulfilling the attributive function and their heads, make possible in actual language use the elision of the attributes without any loss of information (*az én diákom* → *a diákom*). The restoration of the removed attribute in the case of the attributive genitive, however, does not require any change in the morphology of the head (*a diákom* → *az én diákom*). The marker of the elliptic genitive, on the other hand, as we know, blocks the possibility of lexicalization of the removed head if it is not associated in parallel with the change from elliptic into attributive genitive, for example: *a diáké* → **a diáké könyv* (instead of *a diák(nak a) könyve*).

3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

After the removal of the *é*-morpheme from the markers of the genitive case in Hungarian, attention was drawn to the endings *-nak/-nek*. Quite soon, because of the syncretism between (postulated) genitive and dative, there began a long-lasting dispute between the defenders of both cases. Finally in modern Hungarian linguistic literature the genitive has fallen into total disgrace. The majority of Hungarian linguists do not seem inclined to become reconciled with the notion that their language, like many others, is not exempt from case syncretism. In reference to the attributive genitive, however, in the view of the present author, this syncretism seems to be – quite surprisingly – only partial; the attributive genitive is not marked only by the endings *-Ø/-nak/-nek* (homophonous with endings of Nom and Dat) attached to the word fulfilling the attributive function, but they must be complemented compulsorily at the same time by so-called ‘possessor marks’ attached to the word fulfilling the function of the head of this type of attributive syntagm. This “dispersion” of the Hungarian attributive genitive marker seems to constitute a significant contribution to general morphological word typology. If words are grouped into two classes – auto- and allosemificative – according to their independence in expressing the required grammatical meaning, then words belonging to the category of the Hungarian attributive genitive should belong simultaneously to both of these classes. The phenomenon of auto-allosemification would consist in co-expressing the demanded grammatical meaning through two types of morphemes: (i) the autosemificative (*a diák/nak a könyv/e*) and (ii) allosemificative (*a diák/Ø a könyv/e, a diák/nak a könyv/e*). On the other hand, the quite complicated linematics of both types of Hungarian attributive geni-

tive seem to constitute a significant contribution to the general theory of syntax; the difference between the genitive attributes of different grade has a substantial manifestation in this language apart from in the word order. The first grade genitive attribute (determined by second and (further) grade attribute(s)) can adopt only the form marked with the endings *-nak/-nek*. The second (and further) grade attribute(s), on the other hand, can adopt only the endingless form of the attributive genitive. If the word fulfilling the attributive function belongs to the category of personal pronoun, there can be identified concord in person and number between it and the word fulfilling the function of the head, for example: *az én könyvem, a te könyved, az ő könyve*, etc. Because of their redundancy the personal pronouns in actual language use are often subject to elision. This phenomenon seems to provide a basis for some linguists to state that the analysed morphemes fulfil no syntagmatic function. This approach, however, is inconsistent with the analogous elision of personal pronouns occurring with finite verbal forms. In reference to these, no Hungarian linguist would claim that they do not have this kind of function. At the present time the possibility of homonymy which leads to total ambiguity between Gen (attrib^I) and Dat seems to be very clearly restricted, for example: *Visszaadtam a diáknak a könyvét* 'I returned the student's book' or 'I returned the student his book'. The suggestion that Gen (attrib^I) was derived from Dat is within the scope of diachronic considerations, which in the present-day synchronic description of the Hungarian language should not be reflected as valid dependencies. The boundary between genitive and dative is systematically maintained not only by syntactic factors; the morphosyntactic factors such as: (i) syncretism between Gen (attrib^I) and Nom (whereas Dat-Nom syncretism seems to be excluded) and (ii) semificative insufficiency of the markers of the Gen (attrib^I) which must be complemented by the markers of Gen (attrib^{II}), are circumstances that cannot be ignored. In the light of these considerations, words with the endings *-nak/-nek* in phrases such as *A diáknak van könyve* 'The student has a book' should be further recognized as manifestations of the dative case. The complementary distribution of the manifestations of the *é*-genitive on one hand and the Ø-/nak-/nek-genitive on the other constitutes, together with the other facts discussed, quite a solid base for the recognition of the upper morphosyntactic category called genitive case as valid for Hungarian. As a result of the process of elision of certain words fulfilling the function of the attribute or its head, there come into being words in which the maximally four case markers can be identified (*diákoméét* 'the one of the one of my student'). The first one belongs to the Gen (attrib^{II}), the second and the third one to the elliptic genitive, and the fourth one belongs to a case category generally recognized within Hungarian linguistics. Hungarian turns out to be a language which accumulates different casual meanings all marked (except the nominative) substantially within the boundaries of one word.

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

* – incorrect; / – boundary between morphemes; **Acc** – accusative (case); **Activ** – active (voice); **Artic** – article; **Dat** – dative (case); **Def** – definite (article); **ellipt** – elliptic (genitive); **Gen** – genitive (case); **Gen (attrib^I)** – the first part of the discontinuative attributive genitive marker; **Gen (attrib^{II})** – the second part of the discontinuative attributive genitive marker; **-Gen (attrib^I) Sg-** – abbreviations between hyphens inform about the grammatical meaning(s) conveyed by one appropriate morpheme; **I** – first (person); **II** – second (person); **III** – third (person); **Ind** – indicative (mood); **Nom** – nominative (case); **Ø** – morphological zero; **Objectiv** – objective (conjugation); **Pl** – plural (number); **Praes** – present (tense); **Praet** – past (tense); **Sg** – singular (number); **student/Sg** – the meaning of singularity is conveyed by the stem itself (for example *student*); **Subjectiv** – subjective (conjugation)

REFERENCES

- ANTAL László. 1959. "Gondolatok a magyar főnév birtokos ragozásáról." *Magyar Nyelv* 55, 351–357.
- ANTAL László. 2005. *A formális nyelvi elemzés. A magyar esetrendszer*. Budapest: SZAK Kiadó.
- ARTOWICZ Elżbieta. 2003. *Morfosyntaktyczny model języka w dawnych gramatykach węgierskich. Od Jánosa Sylvestra do Ferenc Verseghegyo*. Warsaw: Katedra Hungaryistyki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- BAŃCZEROWSKI Jerzy. 1980. *Systems of Semantics and Syntax. A Determinational Theory of Language*. Warsaw–Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- BAŃCZEROWSKI Jerzy. 2008. "Wyraz w ujęciu morfologiczno-typologicznym." In: BEDNARCZUK et al. 2008: 233–260.
- BÁRCZI Géza. 1963. *A magyar nyelv életrajza*. Budapest: Gondolat Kiadó.
- BATÓG Tadeusz. 1967. *The Axiomatic Method in Phonology*. London: Routledge and Kegan.
- BEDNARCZUK Leszek, SMOCZYŃSKI Wojciech, WOJTYŁA-ŚWIERZOWSKA Maria (eds.). 2008. *Językoznawstwo historyczne i typologiczne. W 100-lecie urodzin Prof. Tadeusza Milewskiego*. Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- BIELECKI Robert. 2010. "Does the Genitive Operate in the Hungarian Case System? I. The *é*-Genitive." *Lingua Posnaniensis* LII (2), 7–25.
- BLAKE Barry J. 1997. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- É. KISS Katalin. 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KESZLER Borbála et al. (eds.). 2000. *Magyar grammatika*. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó.
- KIEFER Ferenc 1987. "A magyar főnév esetei." *Magyar Nyelv* 83, 481–486.
- KIEFER Ferenc (ed.). 2000. *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan. Morfológia*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- KISS Jenő, SZÜTS László (eds.). 1991. *Tanulmányok a magyar nyelvtudomány történetének témaköréből*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- KISS Jenő, PUSZTAI Ferenc (eds.). 2005. *Magyar nyelvtörténet*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- KORHONEN Mikko. 1991. "Remarks on the Structure and History of the Uralic Case System." *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 83, 163–180.
- MELCSUK Igor. 1968. "A magyar főnévragozás egy újabb modellje." *Magyar Nyelv* 61, 176–192.
- PAPP István. 1955. "A jelfunkció kérdéséhez." *Magyar Nyelv* 51, 290–297.
- PETE István. 2003. "Hány esetük van a magyar főneveknek?" *Magyar Nyelvőr* 127, 308–313.
- SANG-HYUP Lee. 1990. *Konfrontative Analyse zwischen dem ungarischen und koreanischen Kasussystem*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag.
- SEBEOK Thomas A. 1946. "Finnish and Hungarian Case Systems. Their form and Function." *Acta Instituti Universitatis Holmiensis*. Series B. Linguistica 3. Stockholm.
- SZABOLCSI Anna. 1991. "A genitivusz – dativusz vitája." In: KISS & SZÜTS 1991: 635–639.
- TOMPA József. 1960. "A magyar főnév birtokos ragozásáról." *Magyar Nyelv* 56, 48–51.
- TOMPA József. 1968. *Ungarische Grammatik*. Mouton: The Hague–Paris.