

Infinitival clauses as syntactic subjects in Hungarian

György Rákosi

This paper outlines a novel LFG-theoretic analysis of *modal/evaluative predicate+infinitive* constructions in Hungarian in which the infinitival argument is argued to be the syntactic subject of the matrix clause. This claim is established as a result of a careful investigation of various embedding constructions sensitive to the subject function.

1. Introduction

Hungarian modal and evaluative predicates may occur in three different syntactic structures, depending on whether the non-dative-marked argument is a DP (1a), a finite CP (1b), or an infinitival IP (1c).

- (1) a. Péter-nek fontos a győzelem.
Peter-DAT important the victory.NOM
'Victory is important for Peter.'
- b. Péter-nek fontos (az), hogy győz-z-ön.
Peter-DAT important it.NOM that win-SUBJUNCTIVE-3SG
'It is important for Peter that he wins.'
- c. Péter-nek fontos (*az) győz-ni-e.
Peter-DAT important it.NOM win-INF-3SG
'It is important for Peter to win.'

This paper focuses on the infinitival construction represented by (1c) and I investigate pattern (1a) mainly to provide further support for my basic claim that the infinitival clause in (1c) is mapped onto the subject function. I present an LFG-theoretic analysis in which the argument structure of the matrix predicate is assumed to be similar across the three syntactic patterns above.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In section 2, a brief descriptive background is provided. In section 3, I present an exhaustive survey of the theoretically possible analyses of the functional status of the infinitival argument of modal and evaluative predicates. Then, various embedding constructions are examined in section 4 and I conclude that the current, LFG-

theoretic proposal (in which these infinitival clauses are syntactic subjects) (i) gives the right predictions where other approaches may not and (ii) represents the simplest solution in that it employs only well-established, non-superfluous grammatical machinery. Finally, a brief overview of a possible solution to the mapping problem is presented in section 5.

2. Descriptive background

The class of modal and evaluative predicates is categorially non-uniform but all members show the same distinctive syntactic behaviour we represented in (1). Some of the most frequently occurring modals and evaluatives are listed in (2) and (3) respectively.

- | | | |
|-----|---|------------------------------------|
| (2) | <i>kell</i> (v) | ‘must, have to’ |
| | <i>szükségszerű</i> (adj) + (<i>van</i>) ¹ | ‘be necessary’ |
| | <i>lehet</i> (v) | ‘may, can’ |
| | <i>lehetséges</i> (adj) + (<i>van</i>) | ‘be possible’ |
| | | |
| (3) | <i>jó</i> (adj) + (<i>van</i>) | ‘be good’ |
| | <i>butaság</i> (n) + (<i>van</i>) | ‘be a stupidity’ |
| | <i>sikerül</i> (v) | ‘succeed, be a success, work well’ |
| | <i>kellemetlen</i> (adj) + (<i>van</i>) | ‘be unpleasant’ |
| | <i>tetszik</i> (v) | ‘appeal to, please, be liked’ |

The infinitival construction has been a target of discussion in the syntactic literature on Hungarian essentially for the following two noteworthy features.² First, there is general consensus that the matrix predicate can be either monadic or dyadic semantically. One argument is not marked for overt case (cf. 1) and the other bears dative case.³ Thus (4), for example, is monadic on its epistemic reading (a) and dyadic on its deontic reading (b).

- | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---|------------|-----------|--------------|
| (4) | A | gyerek-ek-nek | vonat-tal | kell-ett | jön-ni-ük. |
| | The | child-PL-DAT | train-with | must-PAST | come-INF-3PL |
| | a. | ‘The children must have come by train.’ | | | |
| | b. | ‘The children had to come by train.’ | | | |

Second, the infinitive may be marked for agreement (as in 4), in which case the dative argument may undergo *pro*-drop.

¹ The copula *van* ‘is’ has a zero form in third person singular, present tense, indicative mood.

² Recent works which discuss this construction at length in English include Dalmi (2002), É. Kiss (2002), Komlósy (1994) and Tóth (2000, 2002).

³ Whether the non-dative argument is caseless or it bears (non-marked) nominative case is an issue that I leave unattended in this paper. I simply gloss these DPs as nominative.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the functional status of the infinitival argument. Whether the infinitive is inflected for agreement or not is immaterial. Similarly, the choice between an analysis in which the monadic reading is rendered by a raising construction (i.e. the dative-marked argument is a syntactic, but not a semantic argument of the matrix, cf. Dalmi 2002) or one in which the dative DP receives its *structural* case as the subject of the infinitival predicate (and therefore the matrix is monadic both semantically and syntactically, cf. Tóth 2000), is important but has no immediate bearing on the analysis. I will simply regard the dative DP as always a syntactic and optionally also a semantic, argument of the modal/evaluative predicate. To anticipate my subsequent claim that the non-dative argument is uniformly mapped onto the SUBJ function, the following two general LFG-style lexical entries are assumed for modal and evaluative predicates.⁴

- (5) a. $V_{\text{MOD/EVA}}$: (\uparrow PRED)=‘MOD/EVA<(SUBJ)>(OBL)’
 b. $V_{\text{MOD/EVA}}$: (\uparrow PRED)=‘MOD/EVA<(SUBJ), (OBL)>’

(5a) corresponds to the monadic reading (as in 4a) and (5b) represents the dyadic reading (as in 4b).

3. *Ways of analysis*

Though there is an extensive literature on this construction (cf. footnote 2), out of the many problems that need to be tackled, the question of the functional status of the infinitival argument of modal/evaluative predicates has, by and large, received relatively little attention. In the transformational frameworks (*GB* or *Minimalism*) that have been applied in developing the existing theories (Dalmi 2002, Kenesei 2000, É. Kiss 2002 and Tóth 2000), syntactic functions are treated as derived notions, whereas in LFG they are the primitives of the theory.⁵ What I set out to perform in this paper is a functional analysis of this construction. My strategy is to investigate these predicates in various embedding structures in which the subject slot is controlled and to show this way that the sole candidate that wins the race for subjecthood is the infinitival clause itself.

Let us provide an inventory of the possible analyses before starting the empirical investigation. The target structure is (1c), repeated here as (6).

⁴ Here I disregard the categorial differences noted above. Most of the modal/evaluative predicates that are investigated here are verbs, but, *mutatis mutandis*, the observations and claims to be made below carry over to the non-verbal predicates too. These make up a complex with the copula, as it has been pointed out above.

⁵ ‘In a theory like LFG, grammatical functions are theoretical primitives, not defined in phrasal or semantic terms; therefore we do not define grammatical functions in terms of a particular, invariant set of syntactic behaviors. Instead, grammatical phenomena can be seen to cluster and distribute according to the grammatical organization provided by functional roles.’ (Dalrymple 2001:11)

- (6) Péter-nek fontos (*az) győz-ni-e.
 Peter-DAT important it.NOM win-INF-3SG
 ‘It is important for Peter to win.’

No overt expletive pronominal is grammatical in these structures in Hungarian, as opposed to their English counterparts and therefore it is not immediately obvious which argument is mapped onto SUBJ in the matrix clause or whether there is a syntactic subject in the matrix at all.

I claim that it is the infinitival clause *győznie* ‘(for him) to win’ itself which is the subject of the matrix predicate and the dative DP *Péternek* ‘Peter-DAT’ is an oblique. There have been several proposals in the LFG literature which argue for the possibility of mapping clausal constituents to term functions.⁶ Thus, given the apparent lack of universally valid constraints against clausal subjects, it is legitimate to claim that infinitival clauses in Hungarian can be mapped onto SUBJ.

In the usual case, an infinitival clause would be mapped onto either XCOMP or COMP, depending on whether its subject is functionally or anaphorically controlled (cf. Bresnan 1982). There are three basic possible courses that we can take if these infinitives are treated as complement clauses. First, it can be argued that the matrix predicate does not have a syntactic subject. This is a possibility suggested by Komlósy (‘... impersonal matrix predicates [i.e. modal and evaluative predicates] are, most probably, subjectless entries themselves’ (Komlósy 1994:174).) and this option is also entertained in Kenesei (2000). Tóth (2000:178) relies on the traditional, descriptive terminology in referring to the infinitival arguments of modal/evaluative predicates as *subject infinitival clauses*, but she generates them in a complement position and not in Spec IP, where subjects are generated in the GB-theoretic frame she uses for representation. Thus, she basically subscribes to the no-subject analysis, which is, in principle, also compatible with an LFG theoretic approach, inasmuch as the *Subject Condition* need not necessarily be treated as a universal (Dalrymple 2001:19).

Second, one may also argue that there always is an expletive pronominal subject in the matrix, but that it is obligatorily covert. There are no such Hungarian-specific proposals available. In the LFG literature, an analysis of this kind was proposed for German impersonal passives in Berman (1999).

Third, we may treat the dative DP as a quirky subject on a parallel with the analysis of Icelandic quirky subjects. This view is explicitly argued for in Dalmi (2002) and is hinted at in Kenesei (2000). As expected, the quirky

⁶ See, for example, Dalrymple & Lødrup (2000); and Lødrup (1991, 2001). Arka & Simpson (1998) make the specific claim that clausal complements can be mapped onto SUBJ during objective voice alternations in Balinese. The term functions are the core subset of the subcategorizable functions including SUBJ, OBJ and the family of thematically restricted objects OBJ_θ.

proposal also includes the treatment of the infinitival clause as a syntactic object (Gréte Dalmi p.c.; cf. Dalmi 2002 for a detailed overview).

To sum up the preceding discussion, the possible analyses are as follows.

- (7) a. A1: The infinitival clause is mapped onto SUBJ.
 b. A2: Modal/evaluative predicates are subjectless.
 c. A3: An obligatorily covert expletive subject is present.
 d. A4: The dative DP is mapped onto SUBJ.

These analyses are tested against empirical data in the next section.

4. *Modal and evaluative predicates in embedding constructions*

4.1. *No quirky subjects in Hungarian*

To refute A4, I first investigate constructions in which the non-dative-marked argument of modal/evaluative predicates is a DP. The underlying assumption is that despite the categorial differences in realising the non-dative argument, the structures represented in (1) have similar functional properties. Therefore, if the quirky analysis of the dative-marked argument may be shown to be non-satisfactory in case the non-dative argument is a DP, then the plausibility of a quirky analysis of the infinitival construction is also reduced significantly.

The modal/evaluative predicate always shows agreement with the nominative-marked argument and not with the dative. In principle this does not exclude the possibility of analysing the dative as the subject, on the assumption that agreement is not included among the subjecthood tests. This is the approach taken by Dalmi (2002) with respect to what she argues to be Hungarian quirks and this is how Sigurðsson (2002) treats Icelandic quirky subjects. He argues that primary agreement in Icelandic correlates with nominative case and not with subjecthood and nominative non-subjects may show obligatory or optional agreement, depending on the construction. In the case of the DAT-NOM quirky construction, agreement is blocked with first and second person nominatives (8) and we find agreement in number with third person nominatives (9). These examples are from Sigurðsson (2002:719-720).

- (8) * *Ég veit að honum líkum við.*
 I know that him.DAT like.1PL we.NOM
Intended reading: 'I know that he likes us.'

- (9) *Ég veit að honum líka þeir.*
 I know that him.DAT like.3PL they.NOM
'I know that he likes them.'

In Hungarian, the nominative argument of modal/evaluative predicates agrees with the predicate in person and number, as regular nominative subjects do. So (10) is in direct contrast with (8).

- (10) Tud-om, hogy mi tetsz-ünk nek-i.⁷
 Know-1SG that we.NOM appeal-1PL DAT-3SG
 ‘I know that he likes us / I know that we appeal to him.’
- (11) Tud-om, hogy ők tetsz-enek nek-i.
 Know-1SG that they.NOM appeal-3PL DAT-3SG
 ‘I know that he likes them / I know that they appeal to him.’

If subjecthood is completely dissociated from the presence of agreement, then the Hungarian construction can be argued to be quirky. Nevertheless, full agreement of the non-dative argument in Hungarian contrasts quite sharply with the kind of partial argument we have in the Icelandic construction; and this weakens the plausibility of the quirky analysis of the Hungarian structure.

The non-quirky nature of the dative argument of Hungarian modal/evaluative predicates becomes even more apparent once we consider data from embedding constructions. Subject-control predicates control the nominative and not the dative slot, as is evident in (12).

- (12) Én próbál-ok tetsz-eni nek-ed.
 I.NOM try-1SG appeal-INF DAT-2SG
 ‘I try to appeal to you / I try to have you like me.’

Furthermore, the quirky-subject analysis would predict that in case one modal/evaluative predicate is embedded under another one, there may remain a nominative argument in the subordinate clause, as it is the subordinate dative argument which is either raised into or controlled from the matrix. This is exactly the case in Icelandic, cf. (14) (Sigurðsson 2002:702-703). *Bera* ‘be to, have to’ is a deontic modal verb.

- (13) Mér ber að fara.
 Me.DAT bears to leave
 ‘I have to leave.’
- (14) Svona fólki ber ekki að líka sjálfselkir leikarar.
 such people.DAT bears not to like egoistical actors.NOM
 ‘It is not for such people to like egoistical actors.’

Superficially similar embeddings also occur in Hungarian, though speakers tend to consider most of these odd and some of them even completely

⁷ Hungarian is a discourse configurational language, in which term functions are not coded through structure but basically through morphology. Thus there is no designated position for subjects. The reason why the nominative pronoun *mi* ‘we’ precedes the dative argument in the example is that pronominal subjects are in general *pro*-dropped if they have no discourse or logical function. Thus *mi* ‘we’ is a topic in (10) and topics have to occur on the left periphery.

unacceptable. Nevertheless, we may find examples that are accepted by almost everyone.⁸ The crucial difference between these Hungarian examples and the Icelandic type represented by (14) is that, in Hungarian, both DPs have to be dative, nominative case on either DP is ungrammatical. The following examples were judged to be acceptable to various degrees by native speakers.⁹

- (15) Nek-em fontos tetsz-en-em Gézá-nak.
 DAT-1SG important appeal-INF-1SG Géza-DAT
 ‘It is important for me that I appeal to Géza.’
- (16) ^(?)A terv-nek nem kell Mari-nak tetsz-eni-e.
 the plan-DAT not must Mary-DAT appeal-INF-3SG
 ‘Mary does not have to like the plan / The plan need not please Mary.’
- (17) [?]Mari-nak nem kell a terv-nek tetsz-eni-e.
 Mary-DAT not must the plan-DAT appeal-INF-3SG
 ‘Mary does not have to like the plan / The plan need not please Mary.’
- (18) ^(?)Miért pont en-nek a terv-nek kell-ene
 why exactly this-DAT the plan-DAT must-COND
 sikerül-ni-e Gézá-nak?
 succeed-INF-3SG Géza-DAT
 ‘Why is it exactly this plan that should succeed to Géza?’

I take this variation in judgements to indicate that this construction type itself is not ungrammatical in Hungarian, but there are stylistic constraints on its use. What is important to note is that the dative-subject analysis (A4) would predict that each of (15-18) is ungrammatical, because in A4 the matrix dative argument is related to the subordinate dative slot through control and consequently the second DP cannot be in dative case, only in its ‘original’ nominative. This prediction, however, has just been shown to be false. But if the subordinate subject slot is assigned to the otherwise non-dative-marked argument of the subordinate modal/evaluative predicate (as in the current analysis), then the existence of these data is non-problematic. The controller in

⁸ Each of (15-18) has a *that*-clause paraphrase, which is completely acceptable. This complies with the general tendency in Hungarian to prefer finite subjunctive clauses to infinitival complements in many cases where an infinitival clause would be employed in English. Thus, for example, (i) is completely acceptable, whereas its infinitival counterpart (16) is somewhat clumsy:

(i) Nem kell, hogy tetsz-sz-en a terv Mari-nak.
 not must that appeal-SUBJUNCTIVE-3SG the plan.NOM Mary-DAT

‘It does not have to be the case that the plan appeals to Mary.’

⁹ (16) and (17) are examples from Dalmi (2002), where they are claimed to be ungrammatical. The majority of the speakers I asked did not find them unacceptable, though (17) was in general claimed to be somewhat less fortunate than (16). With neutral prosody, (17) tends to be interpreted for many in such a way that it is Mary who has to appeal to the plan. Non-neutral prosody, especially contrastive intonation on the first dative DP, significantly increases the degree of acceptability in each case.

the matrix bears dative case and it controls the subordinate nominative subject slot and there is a second dative oblique argument in the subordinate clause.

It is possible, however, to maintain A4 by assuming the existence of an alternative lexical entry for modal/evaluative predicates (Gréte Dalmi, p.c.). These entries would have an Agent argument, which is nominative-marked and is mapped onto the subject function. This can explain the grammaticality of (12) and (15), by treating the embedded evaluative predicate as non-quirky. There are at least two reasons, however, why I reject this analysis. First, it does not explain why (16-18) are acceptable to many speakers: *the plan* can obviously never be a proper agentive participant in any situation, therefore no agentive lexical entry may be stipulated for the subordinate predicate. Second, if these alternative entries really existed, we should expect to find them in matrix clauses, too. But traditional Agent-tests do not give acceptable results, suggesting that the true agentive reading is not available in matrix clauses.

- (19) *Én szándékosan tetsz-ek nek-ed.
 I.NOM intentionally appeal-1SG DAT-2SG
Intended reading: ‘I appeal to you intentionally.’

Therefore, I will argue in Section 5 that there is only a single lexical entry for dyadic modal/evaluative predicates in Hungarian, both arguments of which show a restricted number of Proto-Agent properties in the sense of Dowty (1991), but neither is a proper Agent. The agentive nature of the first argument can be strengthened by certain (coercive) construction types, which accounts for the availability of the dyadic reading of the embedded modal/evaluative predicate in (12) and (15).

Thus A4 has been shown to be non-satisfactory if both arguments of the modal/evaluative predicate are DPs. This paves the way for a non-quirky analysis of *modal/evaluative+infinitive* structures too, inasmuch as the subject-analysis of infinitival clauses becomes more plausible.

4.2. Control constructions and infinitives

Modal/evaluative predicates, together with their own infinitival complement, may be embedded under control predicates. It is customary to distinguish between two types of control relations in LFG.¹⁰ *Functional control* is an identity constraint on the f(unctional)-structure of the controlled subject argument and that of the controller. *Anaphoric control* is established in the presence of an anaphoric binding relation between the controller and the controlled arguments, which are nevertheless functionally independent of each other. Raising (or ECM) is treated as functional control in LFG: the distinguishing property of raising predicates is that they select for controllers that are only their syntactic, but not semantic, arguments.

¹⁰ See Bresnan (1982) for a comprehensive presentation of the treatment of control in LFG.

Let us take now two control predicates that do not impose an agentivity constraint on the controlled subject argument: the subject-control predicate *látszik* ‘seem’ and the object-control predicate *lát* ‘see/consider’.¹¹ The reason why only these types of predicates are investigated is semantic in nature: the controlled slots in the construction types investigated below are filled by propositional arguments (i.e. infinitival clauses), which cannot be Agents.

Certain modal and evaluative predicates may appear in both types of control constructions. The subject-control construction is represented by (20-21) and (22-23) are examples for object-control structures.

- (20) Még lehetséges-nek látsz-ott idő-ben befejez-ni a munká-t.
 still possible-DAT seem-PAST time-in finish-INF the job-ACC
 ‘It still seemed possible to finish the job in time.’
- (21) ^(?)Pál-nak sikerül-ni látsz-ott megold-ani-a a problémá-t.
 Paul-DAT succeed-INF seem-PAST solve-INF-3SG the problem-ACC
 ‘Paul seemed to succeed in solving the problem.’
- (22) Jobb-nak lát-t-am még ottmarad-n-om egy kicsi-t.
 better-DAT see-PAST-1SG still stay-INF-1SG a little-ACC
 ‘I considered it better to stay there for a little more while.’
- (23) [?]Lehetséges-nek lát-t-am bemen-ni az épület-be.
 Possible-DAT see-PAST-1SG go-INF the building-into
 ‘I considered it possible to go inside the building.’

Not all of these sentences are equally acceptable to everyone; as a general rule, *that*-clause paraphrases would be preferred in each case (cf. footnote 8). The construction types are, however, grammatical, as is evident from the full acceptability of (20) and (22).

The current proposal, which treats the infinitival argument of modal and evaluative predicates as a syntactic subject, gives a natural account of these structures. In (20) for example, the controlled predicate is *lehetséges* ‘possible’ and the “raised” subject is the infinitival clause *időben befejezni a munkát* ‘to finish the job in time’. Thus (20) would translate literally as ‘To finish the job in time still seemed possible’. (21-23) are analysed similarly.

These data, however, are also compatible with the covert expletive analysis

¹¹ I am using the LFG terminology here. As noted above, the traditional distinction in transformational grammar between control and raising (or ECM) predicates is treated in LFG as a distinction between the controller argument being or not being a semantic argument of the control predicate. The anonymous reviewer of this paper suggests that *lát* ‘see/consider’ is presumably not an ECM-predicate. É. Kiss (2002:200) shares this assumption, whereas Dalmi (2002: 4.3.3.2.2) argues against it. Whether *lát* ‘see/consider’ is an ECM predicate or not is a question orthogonal to our discussion here. What is important is that *lát* ‘see/consider’ does not impose an agentivity constraint on the controlled subject. I continue using the term *control* in the LFG-sense.

(Huba Bartos, p.c.). In that case the Hungarian construction would be like the English translations, except that, for some reason, the expletive pronominal cannot be pronounced in Hungarian. The quirky subject analysis (A4) may also be considered to be satisfactory in *this* case (suspending temporarily the conclusion reached in section 4.1), if control is thought to operate along the assumed dative subjects (which can be *pro*-dropped, as in 22, or there is a generic null pronominal occupying this argument slot, as in (20) and (23)).

The only analysis which is evidently incompatible with these data is the no-subject analysis (A2). The embedded subject is defined to exist in control constructions and this simply contradicts A2.

4.3. Adjunct adverbial participle clauses and infinitives

There are two types of adverbial adjunct clauses in Hungarian.¹² Adverbial participles marked with the $-vA$ ¹³ participial suffix may never have an overt subject and they are functionally controlled by the matrix subject.

- (24) (*János) haza-érkez-ve, mi is elkezd-t-ünk en-ni.
 John.NOM home-arrive-PART we.NOM too start-PAST-1PL eat-INF
 ‘(*John) Having arrived home, we also started to eat.’

Adverbial participles marked with the $-v\acute{A}n$ suffix may have a nominative-marked subject, which is referentially distinct from the matrix subject.

- (25) (János) haza-érkez-vén, mi is elkezd-t-ünk en-ni.
 John.NOM home-arrive-PART we.NOM too start-PAST-1PL eat-INF
 ‘(John) having arrived home, we also started to eat.’

This participial construction has an archaic flavour, but it is still used productively in journalism and native speakers have sound intuitions about its acceptability. Let us now see what happens if a modal or an evaluative predicate with its infinitival argument occurs both in the matrix and in the adverbial clause.

- (26) Nem sikerül-vén/*-ve idő-ben befejez-ni-e a feladat-ot,
 not succeed-PART time-in finish-INF-3SG the exercise-ACC
 Péter-nek abba kell-ett hagyni-a a verseny-t.
 Peter-DAT PARTICLE must-PAST finish-INF-3SG the competition-ACC
 ‘Not succeeding in finishing the exercise in time, Peter had to quit the competition.’

¹² Recent overviews of these constructions include É. Kiss (2002), Komlósy (1994) and Tóth (2000b).

¹³ The two participial suffixes in question show vowel harmony, i.e. the vowel changes in harmony with the phonological properties of the stem.

As indicated, native speakers uniformly reject the *-vA*-participle version and the majority considers the *-vÁn* version completely acceptable. However, in general, everyone finds a contrast between the two, favouring the latter.

(26) is an evident problem for the dative-subject analysis (A4), as it predicts that both participles are grammatical in the construction: the matrix dative (analysed in A4 as a subject) should be able to control the subject slot in the participial clause (the argument slot which is indexed to the dative argument in A4). But the *-vA*-participle version is unacceptable.

The no-subject analysis (A2) correctly predicts the *-vA*-participle version to be ungrammatical, as the functionally controlled subject slot of the participle has to exist for the necessary control relation to hold. It is not obviously evident what A2 would say about the acceptability of the *-vÁn*-version, as it may be possible that this type of participle, which is not functionally controlled, tolerates subjectless predicates, if such predicates really exist in Hungarian (for some related discussion, cf. Tóth 2000 and 2000b). As we have already found empirical evidence against A2 in section 4.2, this problem may be left unattended here.

The covert-expletive analysis (A3) can explain the difference in grammaticality between the two versions of (26). The *-vÁn*-version is grammatical as the covert pronominal subject of the participle does not have to be controlled. The *vA*-version is predicted to be ungrammatical because the matrix and the subordinate covert expletives bear different referential indices, as the infinitival complements are different. The control relation is, presumably, ruled out by the presence of these distinct indices. This would predict, however, that if the matrix and the participial predicate share the same infinitival complement (i.e. the structure is elliptic), then the *vA*-version is also grammatical, given the extensional equivalence of the two covert expletives. In fact, such constructions are ungrammatical with both participial types and it is not exactly clear why.

- (27) *Soká-ig nem sikerül-vén/-ve,
 long-for not succeed-PART
 a végén már nem is volt jó haza-men-ni.
 the finally yet not too was good home-go-INF
Intended reading: ‘As we didn’t succeed in doing so for a long time,
 going home wasn’t so good after all.’

This elliptical construction appears to be ungrammatical for reasons independent from the choice of the participle, which means that we cannot use it to decide whether A3 gives the right predictions in this case or not.

The current analysis (A1) gives the simplest account. The *vA*-version of (26) is out because there is an overt subject present: the infinitival argument itself. The presence of an overt subject is tolerated in *-vÁn* participial adjunct clauses and therefore in an A1-frame we expect the *-vÁn*-version to be grammatical, which it indeed is.

4.4. Summary

Now we have a sufficient amount of data at our disposal to reduce the number of empirically valid analyses of these infinitival structures by half. I argued against the quirky dative-subject analysis (A4) in 4.1 and in the preceding section, A4 has been shown to make the wrong predictions about grammaticality patterns in participial adverbial clauses. The no-subject analysis (A2) is incompatible with the existence of those control structures that we saw in 4.2. Therefore A2 and A4 can be rejected on empirical grounds: these modal/evaluative predicates do have a subject and that subject is not quirky.

On the other hand, no empirical data has been found which might be utilised to decide whether the infinitival clause argument of modal/evaluative predicates is a syntactic subject itself (A1), or it is a complement coindexed with an obligatorily covert expletive subject (A3).¹⁴ A3 can be accommodated in LFG by assuming that it is the verbal agreement morphology which specifies the subject (in which case the agreement morpheme is treated as an incorporated pronoun, cf. Bresnan 2001). This is how Berman (1999) analyses German impersonal passives of intransitive verbs, which do not license an overt expletive.

- (28) ... weil (*es) getanzt wurde.
 because it danced was
 ‘.... because there was dancing.’

The reader is referred to Berman (1999) for the details, but what is important to note is that the main driving force for her to propose that in (28) the subject is specified by the verbal agreement morphology, is that, this way, the Subject Condition can be saved.

We have already found empirical proof that Hungarian modal and evaluative predicates have a subject argument. As opposed to German

¹⁴ Tóth (2000) explicitly argues against A3. Her argumentation is based on double embedding data, which she takes to be ungrammatical, as the following example (Tóth:2000, 178):

- (i) *Nem szabad-na fontos-nak len-ni-e Kati-nakidő-ben megérkez-ni-e.
 not may-COND important-DAT be-INF-3SG Kate-DAT time-in arrive-INF-3SG
 ‘It should not be important for Kate to arrive in time.’

She claims that the agreement marker on *lennie* ‘be-INF-3SG’ could in principle license a covert expletive pronominal subject for the predicate *fontos* ‘important’, but the fact that the structure is ungrammatical compels us to abandon the covert pronominal subject analysis.

I do not discuss these structures in detail here but let me note the following. First, these constructions, in which one modal/evaluative predicate is embedded under another one as an infinitive itself, are distinctively awkward but not rejected uniformly by native speakers. Second, it is not obvious how the presence or absence of agreement marking on the first infinitive correlates with acceptability judgements. Third, the current approach would not predict these structures to be ungrammatical but only too complex for the general processing capability of the human mind. In any case, Tóth’s conclusion supports my analysis, but it is dubious whether we can regard these structures as firm empirical ground to argue against A3.

impersonal passives, these Hungarian constructions have an obvious candidate for subjecthood: the non-dative-marked argument. The least costly and the simplest solution, which gives a natural account of the various embedding data we have investigated, is to treat this argument, whether an infinitive or a DP, as the subject itself. Assuming that in the infinitival structures modal and evaluative predicates take obligatorily covert pronominals in Hungarian would make these predicates rather peculiar: Hungarian is a *pro*-drop language but there are no predicates that require obligatory covert pronominals with no inherent lexical content.

Therefore I claim that the only solution which is both empirically valid and does not utilise superfluous grammatical machinery is the analysis which treats these infinitival argument clauses as the subjects of the matrix predicate. This entails that these modal and evaluative predicates have the same argument structure, irrespective of the categorial variation in realising the non-dative argument and they have the general lexical entry in (5), repeated here as (29).

- (29) a. $V_{\text{MOD/EVA}}$: (\uparrow PRED)=‘MOD/EVA<(SUBJ)>(OBL)’
 b. $V_{\text{MOD/EVA}}$: (\uparrow PRED)=‘MOD/EVA<(SUBJ), (OBL)>’

Any differences among the three patterns represented in (1) are considered to be derivative of the categorial differences between the constituent parts of the constructions.¹⁵ At the functional level, the constructions are uniform. In the last section, I briefly discuss a possible approach to derive this functional uniformity from a single common argument structure.

5. *The mapping problem*

It is generally assumed that dyadic modal and evaluative predicates select for a dative Experiencer argument (cf. Dalmi 2002, Kenesei 2002 and Tóth 2000) and a Theme or Propositional second argument, depending on whether this argument is a DP or a clause. This basically fits in with the two-place unaccusative analysis of the Italian *piacere*-class (as in Belletti & Rizzi 1988), inasmuch as these Hungarian predicates are argued to have matching argument-structure properties (Dalmi 2002).

Not intending to deny the existence of possible correlations of this kind, I briefly describe the outlines of a different approach, which may also provide a satisfactory solution to the mapping problem these predicates represent. The starting point is Reinhart’s analysis (2001), in which the second (the dative)

¹⁵ I have not discussed the construction in which the non-dative argument is realised as a finite *that*-clause complement and which allows for overt expletive pronominals in the matrix. The current analysis generalises over to these structures if Lipták’s proposal (1998) is on the right track. She argues that *az* ‘it, that’ is base-generated in the specifier position of the finite CP complement. The main objective of this paper is to provide a proper functional characterisation of the infinitival structure. I consider Lipták’s analysis a natural path along which to extend the current one.

argument of two-place unaccusatives is a participant which necessarily bears no causal relation to the event and which may, but need not, be interpreted as an Experiencer. This allows for a somewhat more liberal understanding of the role of the second argument than Experiencer proper, or in Dowty's (1991) terms, to associate fewer Proto-Agent entailments with this argument slot than in the case of proper Experiencers. As is well-known, modals (and to a lesser degree, evaluatives too) allow for a wide spectrum of interpretational possibilities and it is indeed not very obvious to what extent *sentience*, this primary Experiencer property, is involved in being the subject of the modal in, for example, *We had to take a bus because taxi drivers were on strike*.

With respect to the first argument, Reinhart (2001:9) remarks that it 'appears to show volitionality properties, similar to those of Agents', her example being *Max appealed to the judge*. I have argued in section 4.1 that volitionality is a component compatible with the semantics of these participants and it can be strengthened in certain constructions, cf. especially (12) and (15). This is not to say that they are Agents, but only to deny that the Proto-Patient entailments *undergoes change of state* and especially *causally affected by another participant* are part of the semantic specification of these arguments. In fact, it is this participant which may be argued to have an influence in some sense (definitely weaker than the *cause* relation of Reinhart, which is interpreted as a sufficient condition for the relevant event to hold) on the dative argument. In other words, the first argument is not a Theme.

What this may suggest is that the semantics of these two argument roles approximate, in the sense that neither of them is more evidently Agent-like than the other. Thus which one of the two becomes a subject may not be decided through a straightforward algorithm at the level of the lexical semantics of these predicates. This scenario represents no a priori problems for a mapping theory such as the one generally employed in LFG (cf. Bresnan 2001 for details), which maps a(argument)-structures as *lexical syntactic structures* to f(unctional)-structures. As a lexical syntactic structure, an a-structure contains information also about the syntactic classification of each argument role, one of the lexical syntactic features being [+/-semantically restrictive]. As the second argument of dyadic modal/evaluative predicates is semantically restricted (which is clear at least in the case of clausal complementation, when this argument slot is the controller of the subordinate agentive subject and therefore this argument has [+human] denotation), if it is assigned the [+r] feature at a-structure then it is secured in the LFG mapping theory that this argument is mapped onto an oblique function: the one which is marked by dative case. It is the other argument, which is not restricted semantically and which I have argued to be non-patient-like, that is mapped onto SUBJ to satisfy the Subject Condition.

The details of this mapping are not presented here due lack of space. Besides, it needs to be admitted that these predicates represent a real challenge to any attempt at regularisation. My point is simply to show that an Experiencer – Theme analysis disregards important aspects of the lexical semantics of these predicates, which is considered to be the ultimate

determinant of thematic role types both in LFG and in Dowty (1991) and any other lexically-oriented frames. I believe the approach outlined here may provide a sound account for both the argument structure uniformity that is assumed to exist behind the three patterns of occurrence of modals (cf. 1) and for the mapping problems that these predicates represent.

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to Huba Bartos, Gréte Dalmi and Tibor Laczkó for being able to discuss certain aspects of this proposal with them. I also thank the anonymous Console reviewer for the extensive comments on the draft version of the paper. Any errors are mine. Part of the research leading to the writing of this paper was carried out at the Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS during my stay there as a Marie Curie fellow for the academic year 2002-2003.

References

- Arka, W. & J. Simpson. (1998). Control and complex arguments in Balinese. Butt, M. & T. H. King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG98 Conference*. CSLI, Stanford.
- Belletti, A. & L. Rizzi. (1988). Psych-verbs and Theta-Theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, pp. 291-352.
- Berman, J. (1999). Does German satisfy the Subject Condition? Butt, M. & T. H. King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG99 Conference*. CSLI, Stanford.
<http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/4/lfg99.html>
- Bresnan, J. (1982). Control and complementation. Bresnan, J. (ed.), *The mental representation of grammatical relations*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 282-390.
- Bresnan, J. (2001). *Lexical-functional syntax*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.
- Dalrymple, M. (2001). *Lexical functional grammar*. Academic Press, New York.
- Dalrymple, M. & H. Lødrup (2000). The grammatical functions of complement clauses. Butt, M. & T. H. King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG00 Conference*. CSLI, Stanford.
<http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/5/lfg00.html>
- Dalmi, G. (2002). *The role of AgrP in non-finite predication*. Ph.D. dissertation, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest.
- Dowty, D. (1991). Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67:3, pp. 547-619.
- Kenesei, I. (2000). Van-e segédige a magyarban? Esettanulmány a grammatikai kategória és a vonzat fogalmáról. [Are there auxiliaries in Hungarian? A case study on the notions of grammatical category and argument.] Kenesei, I. (ed.), *Igei vonzatszerkezet a magyarban*. Osiris, Budapest, pp. 157-196.
- É. Kiss, K. (2002). *The syntax of Hungarian*. CUP, Cambridge.
- Komlósy, A. (1994). Complements and adjuncts. Kiefer, F. & K. É. Kiss (eds.), *The syntactic structure of Hungarian. Syntax and semantics 27*. Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 91-178.
- Lipták, A. (1998). A magyar fókuszemelések egy minimalista elemzése. [A Minimalist analysis of focus-raising in Hungarian.] Büky, L. & M. Maleczki (eds.), *A mai magyar nyelv leírásának módszerei III*. JATE, Szeged.
- Lødrup, H. (1991). Clausal complements in English and Norwegian. *Norsk Lingvistik Tidsskrift* 9, pp. 105-136.
- Lødrup, H. (2002). Infinitival complements in Norwegian and the form-function relation. Butt, M. & T. H. King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG02 Conference*. CSLI Publications, National Technical University of Athens, pp. 274-291.
- Reinhart, T. (2001). A synopsis of "The Theta System". Ms. Uil-OTS, Utrecht.
- Sigurðsson, H. Á. (2002). To be an oblique subject: Russian vs. Icelandic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20, pp. 691-724.
- Tóth, I. (2000). *Inflected infinitives in Hungarian*. Ph.D. dissertation, Tilburg University.
- Tóth, I. (2000b). *Va-* and *ván-* participles in Hungarian. Alberti, G. & I. Kenesei (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian 7*. JATEPress, Szeged, pp. 237-258.
- Tóth, I. (2002). Can the Hungarian infinitive be possessed? Kenesei, I. & P. Siptár (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian 8*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, pp. 133-160.