

## Overt Nominative Subjects in Infinitival Complements in Hungarian

Anna Szabolcsi

New York University, October 2008

Submitted to den Dikken and Vago, eds., Proceedings of ICSH 8

### 1. Outline of the argument

This paper is concerned with data that I discovered exactly 20 years ago and have been grappling with ever since: overt nominative subjects in infinitival complements. Although I do not claim to have a definitive analysis yet, the good news is that syntactic theory seems to be in a better position to tackle them today than it was back then.

The following two examples will give a sense of the data. Note that ‘only DP’ is interpreted inside the complement.

- (1) Context: A group of friends boards a crowded bus that has only one vacant seat.

Senki nem akart csak ő leülni.  
 nobody not wanted.3sg only he/she sit.inf  
 ‘Nobody wanted it to be the case that only he/she takes a seat’

- (2) Context: In the past many actors got good roles, but recently directors have lost interest in all but one of them.

Idén elkezdett csak Péter kapni jó szerepeket.  
 this year began.3sg only Peter get.inf good roles  
 ‘This year it has begun to be the case that only Peter is getting good roles’

Example (1) is a case of obligatory subject control. The finite control predicate has its own subject, a quantifier phrase. The verb in the complement bears the infinitival suffix -ni. The infinitival complement contains the overt nominative 3sg pronoun ő (translated as ‘he/she’, because Hungarian has no grammatical gender; in what follows I will pick a gender to simplify the glosses). The pronoun acts as a variable bound by the matrix subject; moreover it has the same *de se* interpretation that controlled PRO classically receives (Chierchia 1989).

The verb elkezd ‘begin’ in (2) is a raising verb. Perlmutter 1970 showed that begin has both a control version and a raising version. The raising version is most easily detected when the complement predicate is not agentive. Crucial to us at this point is the fact that the infinitival complement has an overt nominative subject, Péter.

It will be shown that ő in (1) and Péter in (2) originate in and are located inside the infinitival complement and are moreover the subjects of those complements. If so, what enables them to be phonetically overt, when the subjects of control and raising complements are typically null? A reliable answer to this question is not likely to come from the consideration of just one language, because several different explanations may well be compatible with its data. On the other hand, even a single language may allow us to conclude that some particular property does not constitute a necessary condition. The discussion in this paper is largely confined to Hungarian and its goals are accordingly preliminary and modest. A cross-linguistic investigation is taken up in Szabolcsi 2007 and in work in progress.

Specifically, I propose that the overtness of the infinitival subjects in (1) and (2) is not due to rich infinitival inflection, nor to government of the subject from C, cf. Rizzi 1982 and Raposo 1987. Instead, the critical property seems to be that the infinitival subjects we are looking at agree with finite matrix verbs in person and number. (1) and (2) are, then, cases of *long-distance Agree* (Chomsky 1995). Moreover, at least (1) definitely requires *multiple agreement* (Ura 1996, Hiraiwa 2001, 2005, and Chomsky 2008).

Long-distance agreement and multiple agreement are crucial tools that Minimalism offers and the GB and P&P frameworks did not. Another difference is that back then overtness was thought to depend on abstract Nominative Case being assigned to the subject. But the link between abstract Case and morphological case has been severed, and the usefulness of postulating abstract Case has been called into question by Marantz 1991, McFadden 2004, and many others. In this paper nominative case is mentioned only as a morphological property (a significant one, given that Hungarian has over twenty morphological cases). I remain agnostic regarding any deeper reasons why person-number agreement with a tensed verb allows the nominative DP to be overt.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 sets out to familiarize the English speaking reader with the meanings of the sentences this paper focuses on. Section 3 argues that our nominative DP is located in the infinitival complement, and Section 4, that it is none other than the subject of that complement. Section 5 discusses the agreement with the finite verb. Section 6 comments on the *de se* interpretation of the subjects of control complements. Section 7 concludes the discussion.

## 2. What do these sentences mean?

It may be surprising that a paper on DP overtness starts out with worrying about the precise meanings of the sentences involved. The reason why this is critical is that the nominative DPs under investigation are scope taking operators or are modified by scope taking particles like ‘too’ and ‘only’, and in the sentences where they are claimed to occur inside the infinitival clause they take scope within that clause, carrying what will be called the LO reading. In many cases those LO readings are not expressible (without complicated circumscription) unless the language makes overt infinitival subjects available. Thus the *raison d’être* for the overtness of such subjects is to satisfy an interface need (Reinhart 2006) and to minimize the mismatch between PF and LF (Bobaljik 2002).

Szabolcsi 2007 argues that various languages, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and Russian among them have, or probably have, overt infinitival subjects of the Hungarian sort. On the other hand, English, French, German, and Dutch quite clearly lack them. Over and beyond the theoretical issues that this cross-linguistic contrast raises there is the practical consequence that the reader of this paper may find it difficult to form an intuitive grasp of the examples. The goal of this section is to set the stage by giving an informal sense of their meanings. We use English sentences that do not have the same structures as the Hungarian ones but have similar meanings.

First consider control. The particle too associates with different DPs in (3) and (4). The example most relevant to us is (4): here too associates with the PRO subject of be tall. Krifka 1998 argues that postposed stressed additive particles, like English too, may associate even with a phonetically null element if that is a contrastive topic in his sense.

- (3) Mary wants to be tall.  
I want to be tall too.  
'I too want it to be the case that I am tall'

- (4) This tree is tall.  
I want to be tall too.  
'I want it to be the case that I too am tall'

The well-known reading in (3) will be dubbed the HI reading; the more novel one in (4) the LO reading. The Hungarian counterpart of the control sentence in (3) is rather unsurprising:

- (5) Én is szeretnék magas lenni.  
I too would-like.1sg tall be.inf  
HI 'I too want it to be the case that I am tall'

Hungarian is 'too' is not postposed and not stressed. Conforming to Krifka's descriptive generalization, it cannot associate with a null element. Can the meaning of (4) be expressed using this particle? Yes, but the only possibility is (6), which contains the overt nominative 1sg pronoun én in a position different than in (5). The adverb hamarosan 'soon' makes it even clearer that én is 'I too' goes with magas lenni 'to be tall'.

- (6) Szeretnék hamarosan én is magas lenni.  
would-like.1sg soon I too tall be.inf  
LO 'I would like it to be the case that soon I too am tall'

Next, let us turn to raising. I use the aspectual raising verb begin instead of seem, for two reasons. One is that Hungarian látszik 'seem' primarily takes either indicative or small clause complements and does not easily combine with infinitives. Thus using begin lays better groundwork for the rest of the paper. Another reason is that the truth conditional effect of an operator scoping either in the matrix or in the complement is much sharper with the aspectual predicate than with the purely intensional one. Consider two scenarios and sentence (9).

- (7) *The HI scenario: Total numbers growing, number of first-timers declining*  
In March 10 actresses got good reviews, and they continued to get ones in April and May.  
In April, 4 other actresses got their first good reviews and then continued to get ones.  
In May, another 2 actresses got their first good reviews and then continued to get ones.
- (8) *The LO scenario: Total numbers declining, number of first-timers staying the same*  
In March and April, 10 actresses got good reviews, but in May they no longer did.  
In April, 4 other actresses got their first good reviews.  
In May, another 4 actresses got their first good reviews.
- (9) Fewer actresses began to get good reviews in May.  
(a) 'Fewer actresses got their first good reviews in May than earlier'  
(b) 'It began to be the case in May that fewer actresses overall were getting good reviews than earlier'

(9) is ambiguous. Reading (a) is true in the HI scenario but false in the LO one. It will be labeled the HI reading. Reading (b) is false in the HI scenario and true in the LO one. It will be called the LO reading, and this is the one relevant to us. Crucially, on the LO reading we are not interested in who began to get good reviews but, rather, what kind of overall situation began to obtain.

Given that neither the predicate get good reviews nor the predicate begin to get good reviews have agentive subjects (i.e. instigators of an action), begin is definitely a raising verb on the (b), LO reading. (It is plausibly also a raising verb on the (a), HI reading of (9). This latter fact is irrelevant to us though.) In English (9) the LO reading is a pure “scope reconstruction” phenomenon similar to the classical example (10), and “scope reconstruction” requires a raising construction (May 1985 and many others):

- (10) A unicorn seems to be approaching.  
 HI `There is a particular unicorn that seems to be approaching`  
 LO `It seems as though a unicorn is approaching`

The Hungarian counterparts of the two readings in (9) are as follows:

- (11) Májusban kevesebb színésznő kezdett el jó kritikákat kapni.  
 in-May fewer actress began.3sg prt good reviews.acc get.inf  
 HI `Fewer actresses got their first good reviews in May`
- (12) Májusban elkezdett kevesebb színésznő kapni jó kritikákat.  
 in-May prt-began.3sg fewer actress get.inf good reviews.acc  
 LO `It began to be the case in May that fewer actresses overall were getting good reviews`

To summarize, when a nominative DP is associated with a suitable scope-taking operator, English can express LO readings in both control and raising constructions. But these readings come about in specifically scope-related ways. In the case of control, Krifka’s postposed additive particles under stress have the ability to associate with PRO. In the case of raising, the matrix subject may “scopally reconstruct” into the position of its trace/copy in the infinitival clause. The reader should bear these readings in mind when contemplating the Hungarian examples that carry LO readings, but this paper will not investigate English any further.

The Hungarian examples that carry the same LO readings are syntactically different. As we saw in (6) and (12), the whole nominative DP occurs in a special position. This paper will argue that this is the position of the infinitival subject.

Another fact to bear in mind is that the scopal tricks English employs here are restricted to just a small set of operators. For example, too can associate with a null element but only cannot. Or, fewer NP reconstructs, but every NP and only DP do not. In contrast, in Hungarian the range of operators is not so constrained, because the means to express the relevant readings are more directly syntactic.

### 3. “Our nominative DP” is located inside the infinitival clause

Some of the sentences we are looking at, for example (1), contain more than one DP in the

nominative. One of them is clearly sitting in the matrix subject position and there is nothing mysterious about it. The other one is what we are interested in. This section argues that it is located inside the infinitival clause, and the next section argues that it is the infinitival subject. In the mean time, for want of a better name, it will be referred to as “our nominative DP”.

Recall that in (6) and (12), the Hungarian sentences carrying LO readings, i.e. where the operator scopes below the modal verb, our nominative DPs occur in postverbal position. Hungarian is known to map scope relations to linear order and intonation (see Kiss 2002, Brody and Szabolcsi 2003, among many others), so this may seem like a simple instance of the same correspondence.<sup>1</sup> The placement of csak DP ‘only DP’ and nem DP ‘not DP’ offers clear evidence that on the LO reading our nominative DP is not simply placed within the scope of the control/raising verb.

Due to the association of csak ‘only’ and nem ‘not, constituent negation’ with focus, csak DP and nem DP have a very restricted distribution in mono-clausal examples: they must occur in the immediately preverbal position. The reason is that focus in Hungarian is immediately preverbal.

- (13) \* Olvastam csak én egy könyvet.  
read-past-1sg only I a book-acc
- (14) Csak én olvastam egy könyvet.  
only I read-past-1sg a book-acc  
‘Only I read a book’
- (15) \* Olvastam nem én egy könyvet.  
read-past-1sg not I a book-acc
- (16) Nem én olvastam egy könyvet.  
not I read-past-1sg a book-acc  
‘It is not me who read a book’

The position of csak DP and nem DP completely disambiguates the infinitival examples:

- (17) Csak én szeretnék magas lenni.  
only I would.like-1sg tall be-inf  
HI ‘I am the only one who wants to be tall’
- (18) Szeretnék csak én lenni magas.  
would.like-1sg only I be-inf tall  
LO ‘I want it to be the case that I am the only one who is tall’

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, DP is ‘DP too’ may occur either preverbally or postverbally in mono-clausal examples and so (6) by itself is not diagnostic. In fact, if hamarosan ‘soon’ were omitted, the string in (6) would be ambiguous, with its HI and LO readings distinguished by whether intonation groups én is with magas lenni or not. The main reason why the particle is ‘too’ was used above is that it was useful in conjuring up English counterparts.

- (19) Nem én szeretnék magas lenni.  
not I would.like-1sg tall be-inf  
HI: 'I am not the one who wants to be tall'
- (20) Szeretnék nem én lenni magas.  
would.like-1sg not I be-inf tall  
LO: 'I want it to be the case that I am not the one who is tall'

The puzzle is how csak én and nem én can occur in postverbal position in the LO readings when we have just seen that (13) and (15) are sharply ungrammatical. The fact that (18) and (20) are perfect can only be explained if csak én and nem én, despite being the sole overt nominative DPs in the sentence, are not located in matrix clause but, instead, belong to the complement. If so, then they are not "postverbal" but in fact "preverbal", i.e. their relevant property is that they immediately precede the infinitival verb.

It is well-established that Hungarian finite clauses have a rigid sequence of operator positions in the preverbal field. Koopman & Szabolcsi (2000: Chapter 6) argue that exactly the same sequence occurs in infinitival clauses that exhibit what they call "the English order", i.e. no superficially noticeable restructuring. This descriptive claim has never been contested. Compare, for example, finite (21) and infinitival (22). The linear and scopal order of operator phrases in the preverbal field is topic (RefP), quantifier (DistP), and focus (with or without csak 'only') in both cases.

- (21) Holnap mindenről (csak) én beszélek.  
tomorrow everything-about only I talk-1sg  
'Tomorrow everything will be such that it is me who talks about it/ only I talk about it'
- (22) Szerettem volna holnap mindenről (csak) én beszélni.  
would.have.liked-1sg tomorrow everything-about only I talk-inf  
'I would have liked it to be the case that tomorrow everything is such that it is me who talks about it/ only I talk about it'

These orders make it plain that csak én occupies the same focus position in the infinitival clause of (22) as in the finite (21). There is simply no other way for it to occur where it does.<sup>2</sup>

Crucial to us is the fact that constituent order shows our nominative DPs to be located inside the infinitival clause. Thus the bracketing of (6), (20), and (22) is as follows:

- (6)' Szeretnék [hamarosan én is magas lenni].  
(20)' Szeretnék [nem én lenni magas].  
(22)' Szerettem volna [holnap mindenről (csak) én beszélni].

<sup>2</sup> An important question that I am not able to answer is whether overt nominative infinitival subjects must be scope-bearing operators or can be, say, plain unfocussed proper names. It is difficult if not impossible to find syntactic or semantic tests that tell apart a name that is postverbal in the matrix clause and one that is in the initial neutral topic position in the infinitival complement. If one believes that spelling out the infinitival subject may only happen if this is necessary to express a particular truth-conditional content, then probably such subjects must be operators. But answering such big questions goes beyond the scope of this paper.

Example (22) argues for two further points. First, it shows that our nominative DP does not have to immediately follow either the matrix or the infinitival verb and thus to be governed by it, to use older terminology. An arbitrarily long sequence of operators may separate it from the matrix verb, and the infinitival verb never precedes it. Therefore its overtness cannot be due to “Exceptional Case Marking” or to “Infl-to-Comp” movement.

A second important point has to do with the absence of clause union (restructuring). The suspicion might have arisen that the phenomenon we are investigating somehow requires clause union. The long operator sequence in (22) already indicates that its infinitival clause is not a reduced complement; Koopman and Szabolcsi (2000: Chapter 6) argue that it is a full CP. Further evidence that clause union is not involved comes from the inventory of matrix verbs. Consider utál ‘hate’, cross-linguistically not a restructuring verb, and el-felejt ‘forget’. El-felejt has a prefix, and prefixal verbs never restructure in Hungarian. Both verbs take infinitival complements that contain overt nominatives; in fact, all subject control verbs do.

(23) Utálok [csak én dolgozni].  
 hate-1sg only I work-inf  
 LO ‘I hate it that only I work’

(24) Elfelejtettem [én is aláírni a levelet].  
 forgot-1sg I too sign-inf the letter-acc  
 LO ‘I forgot to bring it about that I too sign the letter’ (cf. I forgot to sign it too)

Szabolcsi 2005 discussed the control data above and tentatively concluded that Hungarian has overt subjects in infinitival complements.

In fact, not only control but also raising complements exhibit the phenomenon at hand. Szabolcsi 2005 mentioned examples with elkezd ‘begin’ and the futurate verb fog, but glossed over the fact that they involve raising, not control. Bartos 2006a and Márta Abrusán (p.c.) drew attention to their raising character. The arguments from constituent order apply to raising complements exactly as they do to control complements, so I add the brackets around the infinitival clause right away.

(25) Nem én kezdtem el [éjszaka dolgozni].  
 not I began-1sg at.night work.inf  
 HI ‘It is not me who began to work at night’

(26) Elkezdtem [nem én dolgozni éjszaka].  
 began-1sg not I work-inf at.night  
 LO ‘It began to be the case that it is not me who works at night’

(27) Csak én nem fogok [dolgozni éjszaka].  
 only I not will-1sg work-inf at.night  
 HI ‘I am the only one who will not work at night’

- (28) Nem fogok [csak én dolgozni éjszaka].  
 not will-1sg only I work-inf at.night  
 LO 'It is not going to be the case that only I work at night'
- (29) Holnap fogok [mindenkivel csak én beszélni].  
 tomorrow will-1sg everyone-with only I talk-inf  
 LO 'Tomorrow is the day when for everyone x, only I will talk with x'

We conclude that infinitival complements of both subject control verbs and subject-to-subject raising verbs in Hungarian can contain an overt nominative DP.

4. “Our nominative DP” is the subject of the infinitival clause

We have seen that our nominative DP is located inside the infinitival clause, but does it originate there? One important argument comes from the Binding Theory.

The crucial observation is that the nominative DP inside a control complement can only be a personal pronoun whereas, as (2) showed, the one inside a raising complement can be a referential DP. This is exactly as expected if the DP originates in the complement clause. In the case of control, our nominative DP is bound by the matrix subject (an overt one or dropped *pro*). If the two are not in the same local domain, a pronoun can be so bound (Principle B), but a referential expression cannot (Principle C). Thus we do not expect to find lexical DPs in the subject position of the control complement. Indeed, (30) is sharply ungrammatical:

- (30) \* Szeretne csak Péter dolgozni éjszaka.  
 would.like-3sg only Peter work.inf at.night  
 'He<sub>i</sub> wants it to be the case that only Peter<sub>i</sub> works at night'

On the other hand, the infinitival complement of a raising verb is not bound by another DP with an independent thematic role; it is free to be a pronoun or a lexical DP. This is what we find.

- (31) Elkezdett csak Péter dolgozni éjszaka.  
 began-3sg only Peter work.inf at.night  
 'It began to be the case that only Peter works at night'

This contrast is multiply important. First, it clinches the Hungarian analysis. Second, it serves as an important diagnostic tool for work on other languages. And third, this contrast hints at the proper analysis. It makes it less likely for example that we are dealing with a case of backward control (with or without control-as-raising). The default prediction of the backward control analysis would be that the lower subject can be pronounced as is, without being somehow reduced to a pronoun. This is indeed what the backward control literature finds (Polinsky and Potsdam 2002, Alexiadou et al. 2008; though see Boeckx et al. 2007). Thus the theoretical challenge is not just to account for when a lower link in a chain can be spelled out in a pronominal form – we are facing the general question of when a DP can be pronounced.

But the fact that our nominative DP in control complements must be a pronoun opens the way for a potential confound. Perhaps that nominative DP is not the subject, just a “pronominal double” of PRO? This question arises especially because languages like Italian, Spanish, and

Modern Hebrew have such pronominal doubles in mono-clausal examples:

- (32) Gianni è andato solo lui a Milano.  
 `As for Gianni, only he went to Milan`

It turns out that in Hungarian, just like in English, such examples are simply ungrammatical. Let us consider two potential cases. First, emphatic pronouns. In Hungarian emphatics are reflexives (maga) and not personal pronouns (ő), as pointed out in Szabolcsi 2005.

- |      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
| (33) | a. Péter maga is dolgozott.<br>Peter himself too worked<br>`Peter himself worked too` | b. Péter nem maga dolgozott.<br>Peter not himself worked<br>`Peter didn't work himself` |
| (34) | a. * Péter ő is dolgozott.<br>Peter he too worked                                     | b. * Péter nem ő dolgozott.<br>Peter not he worked                                      |
| (35) | a. (Ő) maga is dolgozott.<br>he himself too worked<br>`He himself worked too`         | b. (Ő) nem maga dolgozott.<br>he not himself worked<br>`He didn't work himself`         |
| (36) | a. * Ő ő is dolgozott.<br>he he too worked  | b. * Ő nem ő dolgozott.<br>he not he worked   |

Second, consider pronominal placeholders for 3rd person left dislocated expressions. In my dialect (which may or may not coincide with the Budapest, or urban, variety) these placeholders are distal demonstratives, never personal pronouns. (The construction belongs to the spoken language and would not be found in the writing of educated speakers. In this respect it contrasts sharply with our nominative DPs, which do not violate the norm of the literary language.)

- |      |   |   |
|------|---|---|
| (37) | a. Péter az dolgozott.<br>Peter that worked<br>`Peter worked` | b. A fiúk azok dolgoztak.<br>the boys those worked<br>`The boys worked` |
|------|---|---|

To identify such placeholders, it is to be noted that they practically cliticize to the topic and cannot be separated or focused:

- |      |  |   |
|------|--|---|
| (38) | a. * Péter tegnap az dolgozott.<br>Peter yesterday that worked | b. * Péter csak az dolgozott.<br>Peter only that worked |
|------|--|---|

Pronominal subjects do not participate in this construction:

- |      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
| (39) | a. * Én az dolgozott/dolgoztam.<br>I that worked-3sg/worked-1sg |  |
|      | b. * Ő az dolgozott.<br>he that worked-3sg                      |  |

I am aware that there are speakers who use the personal pronoun ő in the place of demonstrative az in (37):

- (40)      a. Péter ő dolgozott.                      b. A fiúk ők dolgoztak.  
                  Peter he worked                      the boys they worked  
                  `Peter worked`                              `The boys worked`

This fact could be a confound if only such speakers, but not speakers like myself, accepted nominative personal pronouns in infinitival complements and if the infinitival construction were similarly restricted to 3rd person. This is not the case. All the infinitival data reported in this paper are perfect for speakers like myself, who do not use (40).

These facts show that the Hungarian control construction under discussion has no possible source in emphatic or placeholder pronouns.

But we can do even better. Postal 1966 observed that personal pronouns in English may take a noun complement. This observation is one of the cornerstones of the hypothesis that such pronouns are determiners.

- (41)      We linguists and you philosophers should talk more to each other.  
 (42)      You troops go South and you troops go North.

Such complemented pronouns do not induce a Principle C violation:

- (43)      We know that only we linguists can do this.

If Principle C is the only reason why our nominative DP in a control complement must be pronominal, then we predict that the pronouns we analyze as overt subjects can take a noun complement. This is indeed the case. The grammaticality of (44) was observed by Anikó Lipták (Huba Bartos, p.c.). The same possibility exists with raising verbs, as in (45):

- (44)      Szeretnénk                      csak mi nyelvészek      kapni      magasabb fizetést.  
                  would.like-1pl                      only we linguists      get-inf higher      salary-acc  
                  `We would like it to be the case that only we linguists get a higher salary`
- (45)      Elkezdünk      nem mi nyelvészek      ülni      az első sorban.  
                  began-1pl      not we linguists      sit-inf the first row-in  
                  `It began to be the case that not we linguists sit in the first row`

And similarly with numerals:

- (46)      Szeretnénk                      csak mi háman      kapni      magasabb fizetést.  
                  would.like-1pl                      only we three.sfx      get-inf higher      salary-acc  
                  `We would like it to be the case that only we three get a higher salary`
- (47)      Elkezdünk      nem mi hárman      ülni      az első sorban.  
                  began-1pl      not we three.sfx      sit-inf the first row-in  
                  `It began to be the case that not we three sit in the first row`

The cross-linguistic significance of complemented pronouns is that in Italian they do not function as emphatic or placeholder pronouns in mono-clausal examples:

- (48) Context: The philosophers say, 'Only we philosophers work'. The linguists reply,
- |        |            |            |          |          |                              |
|--------|------------|------------|----------|----------|------------------------------|
| (i)    | Guarda che | <u>noi</u> | abbiamo  | lavorato | anche <u>noi</u> !           |
|        | look that  | we         | have.1pl | worked   | also we                      |
| (ii) * | Guarda che | <u>noi</u> | abbiamo  | lavorato | anche <u>noi linguisti</u> ! |
|        | look that  | we         | have.1pl | worked   | also we linguists            |

Hence, if noi linguisti occurs inside control complements with the characteristic interpretation described above, it cannot be the pronominal double of a PRO subject. It must be the infinitival subject itself:

- (49) Ø Vorremmo [andare solo noi linguisti a Milano].  
 'We<sub>i</sub> would like it to be the case that only we linguists<sub>i</sub> go to Milan'

Therefore, if a language differs from Hungarian in that it has pronominal doubles in mono-clausal examples, this potential confound can be controlled for using complemented personal pronouns. Caveat: not all similar constructions constitute "complemented pronouns" in Postal's sense. Spanish requires a definite article inside the construction:

- (50) nosotros los lingüistas  
 we the linguists

Clearly, this construction could not be used to argue that nosotros is a determiner. Relevant to us is the fact that nosotros los lingüistas does not have the same distribution as mi nyelvészek and noi linguisti, and unfortunately it cannot be used to eliminate the pronominal double confound the way noi linguisti can.

To conclude, we have argued that our nominative DP is not simply located inside the infinitival complement but it originates there and is the subject of that complement. The critical argument came from the Binding Theory, which predicts the pronoun vs. lexical (referential) DP contrast between control and raising complements. We also noted that the existence of pronominal doubles could be a potential confound for control examples if Hungarian had them in the shape of personal pronouns; but Hungarian does not have personal pronoun doubles. No potential confounding factor is ever present in the raising examples.

##### 5. Long-distance agreement with a finite verb and multiple agreement

All Hungarian infinitival subjects exhibit person-number agreement with the finite verb. To recap, for example:

- (51) Utálok [csak én dolgozni]. (= 23)  
 hate-1sg only I work-inf  
 LO: 'I hate it that only I work'

- (52) Nem fogok [csak én dolgozni éjszaka]. (= 28)  
 not will-1sg only I work-inf at.night  
 LO: 'It is not going to be the case that only I work at night'
- (53) Elkezdtek [csak a fiúk dolgozni éjszaka].  
 began-3pl only the boys work-inf at.night  
 LO: 'It began to be the case that only the boys work at night'

The fact that the pronoun in (51) agrees with the finite control verb is not very surprising; after all, it is controlled by the subject of that verb. Agreement with the matrix verb is more remarkable in the raising examples (52)-(53), since we have no evidence of én and a fiúk ever occurring in the matrix clause.

If the matrix agreement morpheme is removed, effectively turning the inflection into 3sg, which in most verb classes is morphologically unmarked, all these become word salads:

- (54) \*\*\*Utál [csak én dolgozni].  
 hate.3sg only I work-inf
- (55) \*\*\*Nem fog [csak én dolgozni éjszaka].  
 not will.3sg only I work-inf at.night
- (56) \*\*\*Elkezdett [csak a fiúk dolgozni éjszaka].  
 began.3sg only the boys work-inf at.night

When agreement is not possible, there is no nominative infinitival subject. This predicts, correctly, that infinitival complements of object control verbs have no nominative subjects, since the matrix verb is committed to agree with a different argument. Compare object control kényszerít 'force' with the agreeing unaccusative version, kényszerül 'be forced':

- (57) \* Kényszerítettek (engem) [én is dolgozni].  
 forced.3pl me I too work-inf
- (58) Kényszerültem [én is dolgozni].  
 was.forced.1sg I too work-inf  
 LO 'I was forced to work too'

Likewise there are no overt nominative subjects in free-standing infinitives that function as rude or military imperatives:

- (59) (\*Maga is) Távozni!  
 you too leave-inf  
 'Leave!'

The possibility of overt nominative subjects with controlled purpose adjuncts is dubious. I cannot decide whether they are marginally acceptable:

- (60) Péter a balkonon aludt. ?? Bementem a hálósobába én is aludni.  
 `Peter was sleeping on the balcony. I went in the bedroom to sleep too`

Hungarian has a narrower range of infinitival complements than English, so not all examples that might come to the reader's mind can be tested. However, there is an important case to consider. Inflected infinitives in Portuguese take nominative subjects (Raposo 1987):

- (61) Era importante [eles saírem].  
 was important they leave-inf-3pl  
 `It was important for them to leave`

Hungarian has optionally inflected infinitives. The suspicion might arise that the nominative subjects in Hungarian infinitives are related to phonetically overt or covert infinitival inflection. But this is unlikely. Inflected infinitives in Hungarian occur only as complements of impersonal predicates that do not carry person-number agreement and, as Tóth 2000 discusses in detail, they always have dative subjects:

- (62) Fontos volt / Sikerült  
 important was / succeeded
- a. ... délre elkészülni / elkészülnöm.  
 by.noon be.ready-inf be.ready-inf-1sg  
 `to be ready / for me to be ready by noon`
- b. ... nekem is délre elkészülni / elkészülnöm.  
 dative.1sg too by.noon be.ready-inf be.ready-inf-1sg  
 `for me too to be ready by noon`
- c. ... az ebédnek délre elkészülni / elkészülnie.  
 the lunch.dative by.noon be.ready-inf be.ready-inf-3sg  
 `for the lunch to be ready by noon`

(Example (62b) is ambiguous: the dative DP `for me` could be either the experiencer of the matrix predicate or the subject of the infinitive. In (62c) the dative DP `for the lunch` cannot be an experiencer, only the subject of `to be ready by noon`.)

Tóth's observations are important, because they show a crucial difference between Hungarian and Portuguese inflected infinitives. Even if inflected infinitives do license overt nominatives in Portuguese and in other languages, infinitival inflection cannot be the universal precondition for the existence of overt nominative subjects in infinitives. This supports the conclusion that the critical factor is agreement with a finite verb.

The finite clause whose verb agrees with the infinitival subject need not be subjacent to that infinitival clause. In (63) the intervening infinitives *akarni* `want-inf` and *elkezdeni* `begin-inf` do not carry inflection, although they could agree with *én* if they were finite.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The long-distance character of indiscriminate subject agreement is reminiscent of indiscriminate long-distance object agreement in Hungarian. Hungarian verbs have two conjugations. One is selected when there is a direct object that is, roughly, definite (according to Bartos 1999, if it is a DP, as opposed to a smaller projection) and the other is selected elsewhere. The conjugation of a finite control or raising verb is always determined by the direct object of the lowest infinitival complement. The phenomenon is entirely independent of restructuring. Compare *fogok* `will-1sg subject` in (63) with *utálok* `hate-1sg

- (63) Nem fogok akarni elkezdni [én is rossz jegyeket kapni].  
 not will-1sg want-inf begin-inf I-nom too bad grades-acc get-inf  
 'I will not want to begin [to get bad grades too]'

Most of the examples discussed so far contained only one overt subject, either in the finite or in an infinitival clause. The examples were natural, because Hungarian is an Italian-type null subject language: unstressed subject pronouns are not pronounced. But notice that *pro* subjects occur in the same environments as overt subjects. Therefore not only the overt infinitival subject but also the null finite subject must agree with the finite verb. In other words, our control constructions require multiple agreement. The availability of multiple agreement is the default assumption in Minimalism. Support for this analysis comes from the fact that it is perfectly possible for multiple overt subjects to co-occur with a single agreeing finite verb. The sentences below require a contrastive context, but when it is available, they are entirely natural and indeed the only way they express the intended propositions. Imagine a situation where a group of people, including János, is faced with a crowded bus: some will certainly have to walk.<sup>4</sup>

- (64) **János** nem akart [megpróbálni [csak ő menni busszal]]  
 John not wanted.3sg try.inf only he go.inf bus.with  
 'John didn't want to try to be the only one who takes the bus'

- (65) **Én** se akarok [csak én menni busszal]  
 I-neither want.1sg only I go.inf bus.with  
 'Neither do I want to be the only one who takes the bus'

---

subject.definite object' in (i), where the direct object is definite:

- (i) Utálok elkezdni [én is ezeket a jegyeket kapni].  
 hate-1sg.def begin-inf I-nom too these-acc the grades-acc get-inf  
 'I hate to begin [to get these grades too]'

In contrast to the infinitival subject, the infinitival direct object does not require the presence of such a conjugation. It is perfectly happy in sentences without any definite conjugation:

- (ii) Fontos volt [elolvasni a könyvet].  
 important was [read-inf the book-acc]  
 'It was important to read the book'

So, while both the subject and the object may agree with finite verbs that they are not arguments of, in the former case it is the subject and in the latter case it is the definite-conjugated finite verb that seeks out its distant mate.

<sup>4</sup> This generalization revises the judgment in Szabolcsi 2005, where multiple nominative examples were judged to be marginal. I maintain my judgment of those particular sentences, but I have since realized that it is possible to construct many better examples. I am grateful to Márta Abrusán and Huba Bartos for discussion.

- (66) **Senki** nem akart [csak **ő** menni busszal]  
 nobody not wanted.1sg only he/she go.inf bus.with  
 `Nobody wanted to be the only one who takes the bus`
- (67) Nem akarok [**én** is megpróbálni [csak **én** menni busszal]]  
 not want.1sg I too try.inf only I go.inf bus.with  
 `I don't want to be another person who tries to be the only one who takes the bus`

The status of multiple overt subjects in raising constructions is not clear to me:

- (68) ? **János** elkezdett [csak **ő** kapni szerepeket].  
 John began.3sg only he get.inf roles-acc  
 `It began to be the case that only John got roles`
- (69) ?\* Nem fogok [**én** is elkezdni [nem **én** kapni szerepeket]]  
 not will.1sg I too begin.inf not I get.inf roles-acc  
 `It will not happen to me too that it begins to be the case that it is not me who gets roles`

Hungarian does not have overt expletives, and it is generally thought not to have phonetically null ones either. If this is correct then simple raising examples like (2) will not necessitate multiple agreement; only the overt infinitival subject wants to agree with the finite verb.

To summarize, this section has shown that overt nominative infinitival subjects in Hungarian are strictly dependent on person-number agreement with the finite verb. This agreement is not only in-situ but truly long distance: it can skip intervening infinitival clauses. It may also involve a single inflection and multiple DPs.

## 6. De se pronouns and control

The most commonly recognized interpretations of overt pronouns are the bound, coreferential, and free ones. But there is a finer distinction between *de re* or *de se* readings. The coreferential or bound interpretations only pay attention to *de re* truth conditions. The *de se* reading arises when the antecedent is the subject of a propositional attitude verb and is “aware” that the complement proposition pertains to him/herself. The following example, modified from Maier 2006, highlights the *de re*—*de se* distinction. We tape the voices of different individuals, play the tapes back to them, and ask them who on the tape sounds friendly. Now consider the following description what happens:

- (70) John judged that only he sounded friendly. (where he=John)

We are considering the case where he refers to John, i.e. the voice sample John picked out is John's own. But John may or may not recognize that the voice sample is his own. The plain *de re* truth conditions do not care about this distinction. But we may distinguish the special case where John is actually aware that the referent of he is identical to him, i.e. where he expresses an attitude towards himself (his own voice). This is the *de se* reading.

*De se* readings are relevant to us because, as Chierchia 1989 observed, infinitival control

constructions are always *de se*. There is no way to construe (71) with John having the desire but not being aware that it pertains to him himself; (72) on the other hand can be so construed. As the standard demonstration goes, John may be an amnesiac war hero, who is not aware that the meritorious person he nominates for a medal is himself. In this situation (72) can be true but (71) is false.

- (71) John wanted to get a medal. (only *de se*)  
 (72) John wanted only him to get a medal. (*de re* or *de se*)

Both *de re* and *de se* readings occur with quantificational antecedents as well:

- (73) Every guy wanted to get a medal. (only *de se*)  
 (74) Every guy wanted only him to get a medal. (*de re* or *de se*)

The standard assumption is that coreferential/bound pronouns in propositional attitude contexts are ambiguous between *de re* and *de se*; only controlled PRO is designated as a *de se* anaphor. This view is initially confirmed by the interpretation of those subjunctives that are exempt from obviation, i.e. where they can be bound by the matrix subject.

In Hungarian, subjunctive complements of volitional verbs are exempt from obviation in at least two cases (Farkas 1992). One is where the matrix subject does not bear a responsibility relation to the event in the complement proposition. For Farkas 1992, responsibility is the hallmark of canonical control.

- (75) Miért tanul Péter olyan sokat?  
 Nem akarja, hogy pro rossz jegyet kapjon.  
 not want.3sg that pro bad grade-acc get.subj.3sg  
 ‘Why does Peter study so hard? He doesn’t want that he get a bad grade’

The person who gets the grade does not bear full responsibility for what grade he/she gets, since someone else assigns the grade. The subjunctive in (75) has a null subject, but it could be made overt if it bears stress. If such pronouns bear stress, even the non-agentive predicate in the complement is not necessary. I believe the reason is that the responsibility relation is necessarily impaired. One may be fully responsible for whether he/she takes the bus, but not for whether he/she is the only one to do so:

- (76) Nem akarja, hogy ő is rossz jegyet kapjon.  
 ‘He doesn’t want that he too get a bad grade’  
 (77) Nem akarta, hogy csak ő menjen busszal.  
 ‘He didn’t want that only he take the bus’

It is important to observe now that the coreferential/bound non-obviative overt subject of the subjunctive in Hungarian can be interpreted either *de re* or *de se*. E.g.,

- (78) A(z amnéziás) hős nem akarta, hogy csak ő kapjon érdemrendet.  
 the amnesiac hero not wanted.3sg that only he get-subj-3sg medal-acc  
 'The (amnesiac) hero did not want that only he get a medal'  
*de re or de se*

This contrasts sharply with the interpretation of the overt infinitival subject of control complements, as observed by Márta Abrusán, p.c.:

- (79) A(z amnéziás) hős nem akart csak ő kapni érdemrendet.  
 the amnesiac hero not wanted.3sg only he get-inf medal-acc  
 'The (amnesiac) hero did not want it to be the case that only he gets a medal'  
 only *de se*

The interpretation of (78) differs from that of the run-of-the-mill control construction (80) just in what the focus-sensitive operator attached to the subject contributes.

- (80) A(z amnéziás) hős nem akart PRO érdemrendet kapni.  
 the amnesiac hero not wanted.3sg medal-acc get-inf  
 'The (amnesiac) hero did not want to get a medal'  
 only *de se*

The same observations hold for all the other Hungarian control verbs, including *utál* 'hate', *elfelejt* 'forget', etc. So,

- (81) Abrusán's Observation About *De Se* Pronouns  
 The overt pronoun in the subject position of infinitival control complements is interpreted exclusively *de se*.

The standard assumption is that the *de se* interpretation of PRO is a matter of the lexical semantics of PRO. What we see, however, is that an obligatorily controlled infinitival subject is always interpreted *de se*, irrespective of whether it is null (PRO) or an overt pronoun. There are two possibilities now. One is that our overt pronouns are simply phonetically realized instances of PRO, the *de se* anaphor. The other is that *de se* interpretation is forced on any pronominal by the semantics of the infinitival control relation. This latter position seems preferable. Descriptively, it fits better with the fact that in other, non-control propositional attitude contexts the overt pronouns are optionally interpreted *de re* or *de se*, and that non-*de se* PRO is perfectly possible in non-controlled contexts (viz., arbitrary PRO). This position also holds out the hope that once the semantics of infinitival control is better explicated, the obligatoriness of the *de se* reading is explained. The lexical *de se* anaphor proposal would simply stipulate that control constructions only accept lexical *de se* anaphors as subjects.

Languages differ in exactly what exemptions from obviation they allow in subjunctives, but the *de se* interpretation of overt infinitival control subjects is a diagnostic to look for when one wishes to ascertain whether a language exhibits the same phenomenon as Hungarian.

## 7. Conclusion

This paper has argued that infinitival complements of subject control and subject-to-subject raising verbs in Hungarian can have overt nominative subjects. It was proposed that simple assumptions of Minimalism, such as long-distance Agree and multiple Agree, together with standard Binding Theoretic considerations, suffice to explain their availability and distribution. It was pointed out that it seems neither necessary nor advantageous to invoke inflected infinitives, government of the subject from C, or backward control.

If overt nominative subjects in infinitives come so cheap, the question arises why we do not find them in language after language. Szabolcsi 2007 argues that we actually do find them in various languages, although the most intensively studied ones, English, German, Dutch, and French are not among them. What controls this cross-linguistic difference is probably the most interesting research question here. The present paper hopes to facilitate that research by providing a careful description of the Hungarian data and offering a preliminary analysis.

## Acknowledgements

...

## References

- Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Gianina Iordachioaia and Mihaela Marchis 2008. A stronger argument for backward control. NELS abstract.
- Bartos, Huba 2000. Object agreement in Hungarian: A case for minimalism. In: Alexandrova & Arnaudova, eds., The Minimalist Parameter: Selected Papers From the Ottawa Linguistics Forum, 21-23 March, 1997, 327-340. John Benjamins, Philadelphia.
- Bartos, Huba 2006a. És mégis mozog? In: Kálmán, ed., KB 120: A titkos kötet. Tinta, Budapest, 49-67.
- Bartos, Huba 2006b. Eppur si muove? Backward control in Hungarian. Abstract for the 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian, <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/Linguistics/events/ICSH8/program.html> .
- Bobaljik, Jonathan 2002. A-chains at the PF-interface: copies and 'covert' movement. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 20: 197-267.
- Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein & Jairo Nunes 2007. Overt copies in reflexive and control structures. A movement analysis. <http://www.ling.umd.edu/publications/volume15/> .
- Brody, M. and A. Szabolcsi 2003. Overt scope in Hungarian. Syntax 6: 19-51.
- Chierchia, Gennaro 1989. Anaphora and attitudes de se. In Bartsch et al. eds., Semantics and Contextual Expression. Foris, Dordrecht, 1-33.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. The Minimalist Program. The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In: R. Martin et al. eds., Step by Step: Essays in Honor of Howard Lasnik. The MIT Press, Cambridge. 89–155.
- Chomsky, Noam 2008. On Phases. Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory, Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria-Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), 133-166. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Farkas, Donka 1992. On obviation. In Sag & Szabolcsi, eds., Lexical Matters. CSLI Publications, 85-110.
- Hiraiwa, Ken 2001. Multiple Agree and the Defective Intervention Constraint in Japanese. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 40: 67-80. Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Hiraiwa, Ken 2005. Dimensions of Symmetry in Syntax: Agreement and Clausal Architecture. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- É. Kiss, Katalin 2002. The Syntax of Hungarian. Cambridge UP.
- Koopman, Hilda & Anna Szabolcsi 2000. Verbal Complexes. The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Krifka, Manfred 1998. Additive particles under stress. Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistics Theory 9: 111-130.
- Maier, Emar 2006. Belief in Context: Towards a Unified Semantics of *De Re* and *De Se* Attitude Reports. PhD, Nijmegen.
- Marantz, Alec 1991 [2000]. Case and licensing. In E. Reuland, ed., Arguments and Case: Explaining Burzio's Generalization. John Benjamins, 11-31.
- May, Robert 1985. Logical Form: Its Structure and Interpretation. The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- McFadden, Thomas 2004. The Position of Morphological Case in the Derivation: A Study on the Syntax-Morphology Interface. PhD, UPenn.
- Perlmutter, David 1970. The two verbs begin. In Jacobs & Rosenbaum, eds., Readings in English Transformational Grammar. Blaisdell: Waltham, Mass. 107—119.
- Polinsky, Maria & Eric Potsdam 2002. Backward control. Linguistic Inquiry 33: 245–282.
- Postal, Paul 1966. On So-Called 'Pronouns' in English. In Report of the 17th Annual Roundtable Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies, 177–206. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. [Reprinted in Reibel, D.A. & S.A. Schane, eds., Modern Studies in English, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.]
- Raposo, Eduardo 1987. Case theory and INFL-to-COMP: The inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. Linguistic Inquiry 21: 505-537.
- Rizzi, Luigi 1982. Issues in Italian Syntax. Dordrecht, Foris.
- Szabolcsi, Anna 2005 Overt infinitival subjects (if that's what they are...). In: Broekhuis et al., eds, Organizing Grammar. Festschrift for Henk van Riemsdijk. De Gruyter, Berlin, 618–625.
- Szabolcsi, Anna 2007. Hidden in plain sight: Overt subjects in infinitival control and raising complements. <http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000445> .
- Tóth, Ildikó 2000. Inflected Infinitives in Hungarian. PhD, Tilburg.
- Ura, Hiroyuki 1996. Multiple Feature-Checking: A Theory of Grammatical Function Splitting. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.