

Nominative subjects in infinitives: only pronouns?

Krisztina Szécsényi

ELTE School of English and American Studies

kszeccsenyi@gmail.com

Debrecen Workshop on Pronouns, 24 February 2017

OTKA NK 100804 project “Comprehensive Grammar Resources: Hungarian”

The data

- Szabolcsi (2009ab)

(1) *Péter_i nem akar-t* [csak ő_i men-ni bus-szal]
Peter not want-PST.3SG only he/she-NOM go-INF bus-with
'Peter didn't want to be the only one to take the bus.'

Italian:

(2) *Ogni ragazzo / Gianni odierebbe* [andare solo/anche lui a Milano].
every boy / Gianni would.hate go-inf only/also he to Milan
'Every boy_i/Gianni_i would hate it if only/also he_i went to Milan'

Obligatory control interpretation

Multiple Agree + Long Distance Agreement (LDA)

Nominative DP scopes inside the infinitival clause

Interface need: to minimize mismatch bw PF and LF

Problems of the analysis

- (i) No connection made between the left periphery and the availability of nominative subjects (*only*-phrases, *also*-phrases, focused bare DPs – Hungarian infinitival clauses are CPs)
- (ii) It follows from Szabolcsi's analysis that the subject of the infinitive has to be a pronoun, which is not always the case
- (iii) It does not follow from Szabolcsi's analysis that reflexive nominative *only*-DPs are not allowed in the Hungarian construction in question either in restructuring or non-restructuring environments.

Further data

(3) %*Szerintem nem akar-nak [csak a fiúk büntetést kapni]*
in.my opinion not want-3PL only the boys punishment get-INF
'In my opinion the boys do not want it to be the case that only they are punished.'

(4) *Szeretné-nek [a barátaim is felszáll-ni a buszra]*
would.like-3PL the my.friends also get.on-INF the bus-SUBL
'My friends would like it to be the case that they also get on the bus.'

Condition for spelling out a lexical DP in the embedded clause: not having an overt binder present in the main clause (native speaker variation: pro)?

(5) *A fiúk nem akarnak csak ők büntetést kapni.*
the boys not want only they punishment get-INF
'The boys do not want it to be the case that only they are punished.'

Pronouns and reflexives

The embedded nominal is a pronoun both in restructuring and non-restructuring contexts.

The reflexive form *maga* can appear in these sentences, it can always be together with the pronoun and so must be the type with the emphatic function (Bartos 2006).

(6) *Péter nem akart [csak (ő) maga menni bus-szal]*
Peter not want-PST.3SG only he/she-NOM self go-INF bus-with
'Peter didn't want to be the only one to take the bus.'

Lack of different forms (reflexives in restructuring contexts): though the constituents in question are coreferent and can even be interpreted as spelling out the same DP under certain theoretical assumptions (MTC, Hornstein 1999), they are the subjects of different predicates and hence not co-arguments

→ the binding principles treat the two DPs as belonging to different binding domains.

Anaphoric DPs

- Korean

(7) *Inho_i-ka Jwuhi_j-eykey PRO_{j/*i} / caki_{j/*i}-ka cip-ey ka-la-ko mal-ha-yess-la.*
Inho-nom Jwuhi-dat self-nom home-loc go-imp-c tell-do-pst-dc
'Inho told Jwuhi to go home.' [Landau 2013:118(209)]

- Turkish

(8) *Iyi rolleri sadece kendisi / * o al-mak-tan nefret etti.*
good roles-acc only self / he take-inf-abl hate past.3sg
LO: 'He hated to be the only one to get good roles' [Szabolcsi 2009b:43(207)]

Cross-linguistic variation: whether syntactic operations (e.g. ECM, Agree, LDA) can modify binding domains or not.

Reinhart and Reuland (1993)

Antecedent in c-commanding position: chain formation covering all sequences of coindexed elements: the contentful element c-commands all other elements in the chain.

Reflexivity not a structural notion but a property of the predicate.

ECM: the subject of the infinitive becomes the „syntactic argument“ of the matrix predicate

Newson 2014: Binding revisited

Syntax First Alignment system, two constraints:

- Pesetsky (1998): SILENT-T: do not pronounce traces

Movement chains vs. non-movement chains (e.g. binding): in the former only one link of the chain is in a θ -position, invariably the trace. The chains formed in binding situations have all links in θ -positions. Thus a constraint that requires chains with all links bearing θ -roles to be overt will force traces to be pronounced:

- OVERT-C * $\alpha \dots \alpha$, where each occurrence of α bears a θ -role

Newson (2014) and control

Control: movement chain or non-movement chain?

Typically **unpronounced** element:

- PRO
- minimal pronoun (Landau 2014)
- trace/copy (Hornstein 1999)

with θ -role; both members of the chain theta-marked.

Binding: having different θ -roles is not sufficient, it is reflexivity that needs to be spelled out overtly.

First DP pronounced as lexical DP, further DPs either unpronounced (garden-variety control) or pronounced when information structure considerations make it necessary (and the language is such that the infinitival clause can host the respective projections). The most compatible approach: minimal pronoun \rightarrow when extra features appear the pronoun is not minimal any more, it has to be pronounced.

Spelling out the pronoun: why and how?

When the pronoun in the infinitival clause has features sufficiently different from the subject of the finite clause, it is spelled out provided that it can be in the given domain (the infinitival clause) in the language in question. Different chains, or one chain with different features.

Hungarian:

- (i) Infinitival clauses are CPs → foci can appear
- (ii) The infinitive is a domain of obligatory control → no different subjects possible (expressed as subjunctive)
- (iii) Pronominal form: not co-arguments, syntactic operations do not modify the binding domain

More than one member pronounced: different roles (both topic and focus either in one and the same clause or in different clauses), first DP can be lexical.

Surányi (2003): postverbal *only*-phrases

Szabolcsi: the *only*-DP must belong to the (preverbal domain of the) infinitive, as postverbal focus is impossible without a preverbal one.

(9) *Kevés harmadikos evett CSAK A LEVESBŐL*
few third-grader ate-3sg only the soup-from
'Few third-graders ate only from the soup'

[Surányi 2003:41(43)]

Postverbal focus in the absence of a preverbal one, only in this construction-type.

→ counting quantifiers as a special subcase of focus operators

Further data

Nominative DPs (Olsvay Csaba, p.c.):

(10) *(Én) Nem esz-ek csak én leves-t.*

I not eat-1SG only I soup-ACC

'I am not willing to be the only one who eats soup.'

(11) *Csak én nem esz-ek leves-t.*

Only I not eat-1SG soup

'It is only me who does not eat soup.'

Two post-verbal *only*-phrases

Situation: group of scouts preparing lunch. Enough soup for everyone but the main dish is less than needed, some have to do with soup only.

(12) *Nem esz-ek csak én csak levest.*

not eat-1SG only I only soup

I am not **willing to/going to** be the only one who eats only soup

(13) ??*Nem eszek csak levest csak én.*

not eat-1SG only soup only I

Bartos (2002): Root infinitives

- Two main structural configurations to express possibility:

- 1) $[_{CP} \dots [\text{Mod}_{\text{poss}} [_{VP} V_{\text{fin}} \dots$
- 2) $\text{Mod}_{\text{circ}} [_{CP} \dots [_{VP} V_{\text{inf}}]] \rightarrow$ root infinitives

Nem hallani ami-t mond-asz.

not hear-INF what-ACC say-2SG

'It is not possible to hear what you say.'

Proposal: underlyingly biclausal structure with covert modality for (10) and (12).

Difference: finite form, biclausal structure with an empty V_{fin} based on (1).

- 3) $[_{CP} \dots [_{\text{Mod}} [_{VP} V_{\text{fin}} \dots [_{CP} \dots V_{\text{inf}}$

→ the lexical verb in the lower clause moves to the relevant position.

Acquisition?

How do we know?

The postverbal *only*-DP is the cue, the only construction where it is allowed without there being a preverbal focus.

Postverbal focus is not possible in Hungarian without a preverbal one, the postverbal *only*-DP indicates a biclausal structure, is not an exception to the rule.

(14) ??*Nem akarok csak én csak levest en-ni.*

not want only I only soup eat-INF

'I do not want to be the only one who eats soup.'

(15) *Nem akarok csak én en-ni csak levest.*

Not want only I eat-INF only soup

→ *csak én* **is** in the left periphery of the infinitive

Conclusions

- Under a predicate-based construal of reflexivity there is nothing surprising in the pronominal form in the constructions in question
- In Hungarian LDA does not alter binding relationships (vs. Korean or Turkish)
- Seemingly monoclausal sentences with postverbal *only*-DPs contain a covert modal
 - biclausal structure
- The rule according to which postverbal focus is possible only when there is a preverbal focus is exceptionless in Hungarian

References

- Bartos, Huba 2002. 'Root Infinitives' In: Kenesei I. & Siptár P. (szerk.), *Approaches to Hungarian vol. 8*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 13–38.
- Bartos, Huba 2006. És mégis mozog? [Eppur si muove?] In Kálmán, László (ed) *KB 120 A titkos kötet. Nyelvészeti tanulmányok Bánréti Zoltán és Komlós András tiszteletére*. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet, Tinta Könyvkiadó.
- Hornstein, Norbert 1999. Movement and Control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(1). 69-96
- Landau, Idan 2014. A Two-Tiered Theory of Control, <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001937>
- Newson, Mark 2014. Binding revisited. In Mark Newson and Péter Szigetvári (eds) *The Even Year Book 11*, Budapest: ELTE. 31-56.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 657-720.
- Sundaresan, Sandhya. 2014. Making sense of silence: Finiteness and the OC PRO vs. pro distinction. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32: 59–85.
- Surányi 2003. *Multiple operator movements in Hungarian*. Utrecht: LOT Publications
- Szabolcsi, A. 2009a. Overt Nominative Subjects in Infinitival Complements in Hungarian. In: Marcel den Dikken and Robert Vago (eds.): *Approaches to Hungarian 11*. John Benjamins. Amsterdam. 251–276.
- Szabolcsi, Anna 2009b. Overt Nominative Subjects in Infinitival Complements: Data, Diagnostics, and Preliminary Analyses. In *NYU Working Papers in Linguistics, 277 Vol. 2: Papers in Syntax*, Patricia Irwin and Violeta Vasquez Rojas Maldonado (eds.). New York University.