

Tanulmány

Péter Szűcs

On pronouns in Hungarian complex sentences*

Abstract

Hungarian complex sentences with subordinate clauses commonly include a pronoun which is associated with the embedded clause. The nature of this pronoun is subject to debate in the literature: it may be analyzed as an expletive or as a contentful pronoun. This paper argues for the second approach, based on theoretical, empirical and cross-linguistic considerations.

Keywords: Hungarian, subordinate clause, pronoun, expletive

1 Introduction

According to É. Kiss (2002), the structure of subordinate clauses in Hungarian essentially parallels that of the main clauses, so they contain the same structural positions. In the commonly accepted approach, there are only two differences: one, subordinate clauses are optionally introduced by the complementizer (*hogy* ‘that(C)’¹), and two, they are often associated with a pronoun in the main clause. The pronoun is a demonstrative one in form and bears some grammatical function, determined by the verb: it can be a subject (1a), an object (1b) or an oblique complement (1c).

- (1) a *Az valószínű, hogy János fog nyerni.*
 that likely that(C) John AUX win.INF
 ‘It is likely that John will win.’
- b *Azt mondtam, hogy János fog nyerni.*
 that.ACC said.1SG that(C) John AUX win.INF
 ‘I said that John would win.’
- c *Arra számítok, hogy János fog nyerni.*
 that.ALL expect.1SG that(C) John AUX win.INF
 ‘I expect that John will win.’

* This research was supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA), grant No. 111918 (*New approaches in the description of the grammar of Hungarian pronominals*).

I would also like to thank Tibor Laczkó and György Rákosi for the helpful discussions and comments on various ideas included in this paper.

¹ I use the gloss “that(C)” to clearly differentiate the complementizer from the homophonous distal demonstrative.

There are two optional words in such sentences: subject or object pronouns on the one hand, and the complementizer on the other. However, either one or the other may be omitted. In other words, the absence of subject or object pronouns and the absence of the complementizer are in complementary distribution.²

- (2) a *Mondtam, hogy János fog nyerni.*
 b *Azt mondtam, János fog nyerni.*
 c **Mondtam, János fog nyerni.*³

While this basic setup is quite uncontroversial, there are considerable differences regarding the details of the proper analysis. The questions are the following:

- What is the nature of the associate pronoun?
- How exactly is the pronoun associated with the subordinate clause?

There are two basic approaches: according to Kenesei (1992/1994), pronoun is an expletive, forming a chain with the subordinate clause. This account holds that verbs taking a subordinate clause in Hungarian strictly subcategorize for a CP as the realization of their propositional argument. However, these CPs cannot bear case-marking. So the expletive is inserted to enable a “division of labor” between the subordinate clause and the pronoun: the first receives theta-marking, while the second carries the case. This means that verbs occurring with subordinate clauses have lexical entries along the lines of (3a) and (3b), where the first line after “predicate” indicates the entailed thematic roles and the second line shows their possible syntactic realizations. ((3a) stands for a one-place predicate like *valószínű* in (1a) while (3b) illustrates a two-place one like *mond* in (1b)). The expletive pronoun is required by the syntax, so it is not represented in the lexical entries.

- (3) a *predicate* PROPOSITION
 CP
 b *predicate* AGENT PROPOSITION
 DP CP

The alternative view (Tóth (2000), É. Kiss (2002), Rákosi & Laczkó (2005)) holds that the pronoun is not an expletive, but a real, contentful one and the clause is associated with it via complex NP-formation (É. Kiss) or adjunction (Tóth, Rákosi & Laczkó). According to these proposals, the predicates, instead of having lexical entries like (3), have entries like (4). Here,

² Interestingly, embedded wh-questions are exempt from this restriction (I would like to thank Gábor Alberti for reminding me of this fact, which had already been noted in Kenesei (1992: 677/1994: 337)). Although these issues are important aspects in the overall analysis of subordinate clauses, they are not the targets for my current enquiry.

i) *(Azt) kérdeztük, (hogy) ki fog nyerni.*
 that.ACC asked.1PL that(C) who aux win.INF
 ‘We asked who would win.’

³ As my reviewer (who later revealed himself as Gábor Alberti) notes, sentences like (2c) may be grammatical with a careful pronunciation, if a sufficiently long pause is inserted between the verb and the clause. I regard those cases as direct quotations rather than genuine subordinations.

the propositional argument may be realized not only as a CP but also as a DP.⁴ This is how a pronoun can enter the picture.

- | | | | |
|-------|------------------|-------------|-------------|
| (4) a | <i>predicate</i> | PROPOSITION | |
| | | CP/DP | |
| b | <i>predicate</i> | AGENT | PROPOSITION |
| | | DP | DP/CP |

In this paper, I will argue that the second approach is preferable if the entire range of available evidence is taken into account. The structure of the paper is the following. Section 2 provides some background on expletives. This review is essential to weigh the evidence for and against the possible approaches, which takes place in section 3. Besides these considerations, I will further support my endorsement of the second approach with empirical data about the distribution of CPs and DPs in Hungarian complex sentences. After arguing for the second, contentful pronoun-account, in section 4 elaborates on the reasons to prefer Tóth's (2000) and Rákosi & Laczkó (2005)'s adjunction-approach to É. Kiss's (2002) Complex NP-formation one. The paper ends with some remarks on the cross-linguistic perspective of the preferred account.

2 Expletives in generative grammar

Expletives are semantically empty, pleonastic elements in a sentence. Their presence is motivated by some structural constraint, for example the well-known Extended Projection Principle (EPP) of Chomskyan frameworks, which states that the structural subject position (Spec, TP/IP) must be filled.

In the widely accepted theory of pronouns developed by Cardinaletti & Starke (1994), (but see Manzini 2014 for a differing opinion), they are weak pronouns. (However, not all weak pronouns are expletives: there are non-expletive weak pronouns as well.) Weak pronouns contrast with strong ones with respect to several properties: weak pronouns cannot be coordinated, they cannot be in theta-positions or peripheral positions (e.g. left/right dislocation, topicalization), they can refer to nonhuman entities (strong pronouns cannot),⁵ may have "reduced meaning" (e.g. the impersonal reading of *You can never know what the future brings*), and only weak pronouns can be phonologically reduced. For the details of the theory, the interested reader is referred to Cardinaletti & Starke (1994).

There are several constructions in English that have been hypothesized to have expletives in them: extrapositions (5a-b), presentational sentences (5c), weather-sentences (5d), and it-clefts (5e).

⁴ Such underspecifications are debated but not unprecedented in the literature. In Chomskyan frameworks, see Grimshaw (1982), Pesetsky (1993) and Alrenga (2005) for different perspectives on c(onstituent)- and s(ematic)-selection. In Lexical-Functional Grammar, a theory which heavily builds on a rich lexicon as a source of syntactic variation, such underspecifications are less of a theoretical problem; see for instance Dalrymple & Lodrup (2000), where an OBJ grammatical function may be realized either as an DP or a CP.

⁵ Cardinaletti & Starke (1994) focuses on personal pronouns so some of their criteria (e.g. the restriction on animacy) are not directly relevant for demonstratives.

- (5) a *It is obvious that John will win.*
 b *It seems that John will win.*
 c *There is a unicorn in the garden.*
 d *It rains.*
 e *It is John who will win.*

Intuitively, in all of these cases, the pronoun seems to have some sort of reduced/zero reference. This can be seen for example from the fact that they cannot be questioned or focussed. This also follows from the theory of strong and weak pronouns of Cardinaletti & Starke (1994), as these constructions count as utilizing “peripheral positions”.

- (6) a **What is obvious that John will win?*⁶
 a’ **ONLY IT is obvious that John will win.*
 b **What seems that John will win?*
 b’ **ONLY IT seems that John will win.*
 c **What rains?*
 c’ **ONLY IT rains.*
 d **Where is a unicorn in the garden?*
 d’ **ONLY THERE is a unicorn in the garden.*
 e **What is John who will win?*
 e’ **ONLY IT is John who will win.*

In all of these cases, the pronouns are arguably the subjects of these sentences. This follows from the EPP, which is a general requirement on subject positions. However, it has been suggested (Postal & Pullum (1988)) that sentences like (7) contain the expletive pronoun *it* as an object:

- (7) a *I regretted it every time that I had dinner with John.*
 b *We demand it of our employees that they wear a tie.*
 c *I still can’t believe it that he is gone.*

The proper analysis of such sentences is debated. Rothstein (1995) argues that even though the semantics of these pronouns is bleached to an extent, they are in fact not expletives. This can be seen for example from the fact that removing the pronoun results in a slightly altered meaning. Thus, while (7a) means that every event of dinner was matched by an event of

⁶ It has to be added that without the *that*-clause, sentence (9a) is grammatical (as opposed to (9b), which remains ungrammatical without the *that*-clause). Notice also that a clausal subject is only grammatical in the case of *obvious*. For a possible account of the state of affairs, see Alrenga (2005).

i) *That John will win is obvious.*
 ii) **That John will win seems.*

regret, the pronounless version could also mean that there was only one regretting event (for example, some incident makes me reinterpret my evaluation of the past dinners with *John*, which may have seemed happy at those times). Another counter-argument is that Postal & Pullum (1998)'s verbs do occur with uncontroversially semantic objects.

- (8) a *I regretted my decision.*
 b *We demand full compensation.*
 c *I still can't believe the story.*

Another suggestion for an object-expletive in English could be *there* in sentences like (9a). It is known that *believe* can take a non-thematic object in the case of "raising to object"⁷ (9b). However, the fact that it behaves differently from normal non-thematic object for example in *there*'s inability to be followed by a manner-ad adjunct (9c), indicates that perhaps *there* should receive some other analysis.

- (9) a *I believe there to be a boy outside.*
 b *I believe John to be happy.*
 c **I believe there strongly to be a boy outside.*
 d *I believe John strongly to be happy.*

One possible account for the facts could be that *there* is not the main clause object, but is part of the embedded clause. This would explain why a main clause adverbial cannot follow it. However, *there* could be a subject in a passive sentence (*There was believed to be a boy outside*), and that is a strong indication of its status as an object. An alternative could be to maintain the embedded status of *there* in (9a), but argue that it is in some way different from non-thematic objects like *John* in (9b). Such an account could be built on the ground that the non-thematic, expletive status of *there* has been called into question by researchers like Moro (1997) and Tortora (1997). Both of them investigate *there*'s behavior as a subject pronoun. Moro focuses on existential sentences like (5c) while Tortora puts the emphasis on predicates other than *be*, like *arrive* in (10)

- (10) *There arrived four women at the station.*

Both Moro (1997) and Tortora (1997) discard the expletive analysis, but they replace it with different theories. Moro argues that *there* is a predicate, while Tortora advocates an analysis where it is a weak locative argument (weak in the sense of Cardinaletti & Starke 1994). Either of these approaches could serve as a starting point for an account, but the details of that account await further enquiry. Considering the available research about expletives, it seems reasonable to maintain the generalization that expletives occur as subjects.

Going on with the properties of expletives, a contrast is often mentioned between *there* (5c) and weather-*it* (5d). Namely, Chomsky (1981) observed that while weather-*it* can bind an implicit subject (a "PRO" in Chomskyan frameworks) in an adjunct clause (11a), *there* cannot (11b). Extrasposition-*it* patterns with *there* in this respect.

⁷ I use the term "raising" as a descriptive label, not indicating theoretical commitment on my part.

- (11) a *It_i often clears up after PRO_i raining heavily.*
 b **There_i is often a party after PRO_i being a wake.*
 c **It_i is often obvious that Jack is a liar after PRO_i being dubious that he is honest.*

These facts led Chomsky (1981) to the conclusion that weather-*it* is not an expletive, but it is referential in some generic sense. Chomsky labelled it a “quasi-argument”. The fact that existential *there* only possesses a person feature but not a number feature is in harmony with this view, given that ideally, expletives are featurally-impoverished. (The lack of number features can be seen for example from a pair like *there is a boy outside/ there are two boys outside*, where it is the logical subject (*boy*) which determines the number feature of *be*). Consequently, the quasi-argument view seems to be dominant today.⁸

The pronoun in *it*-clefts (5e) has received much less attention in the literature. It shares several properties with the already mentioned expletive-candidates: it cannot have a discourse function, cannot be questioned. So the default assumption in the literature seems to be that it is an expletive (e.g. É. Kiss (1998)). However, Hedberg (2000) calls attention to the fact that the form of the introductory pronoun in a cleft like (5e) is not fixed, but it is determined by the cognitive status of the associated clause. Under the appropriate context it can be replaced by some other pronoun (see (12a)). This is unexpected under an expletive-analysis, them being purely syntactic entities, unaffected by semantic/pragmatic considerations. Other expletive-candidates are fixed in form.

- (12) a *I wasn't surprised by the massacre in China. [pause] This is not Iowa we're talking about. This is a different society.*
 b **This is obvious that John will win.*
 c **This seems that John will win.*
 d **Here is a unicorn in the garden.*
 e **This rains.⁹*

What is evident from this discussion is that the category of “expletives” is not a homogeneous one, either empirically or theoretically. Nevertheless, certain generalizations seem to be plausible:

- i. Expletives are semantically empty.
- ii. They reject discourse-related constructions (questions, foci, topics).
- iii. They are never theta-marked.
- iv. They occur as subjects.
- v. They are required by some structural principle (e.g. EPP).

⁸ For an alternative view (couched in Relational Grammar), where weather-*it* is treated as a “lexically selected expletive”, see Alba-Salas (2004).

⁹ As already mentioned, weather-predicates are commonly assumed to have quasi-argumental subjects. If that is true, we would expect to find some other subjects than *it*. While English examples are scarce, Bennis (1986) argues that the pronoun in Dutch weather-sentences can be replaced by various words, see e.g. (i).

i) Het/ De wind waait hard.
 it the wind blows strongly

- vi. They are featurally impoverished.
- vii. They have a fixed form.

3 Weighing the evidence

After laying these theoretical foundations, now we're in the position of evaluating the merits of the available analyses of the pronouns in question. I will argue that the contentful pronoun-approach is preferable to the expletive-one because a) the pronouns do not show expletive behavior, b) contra Kenesei (1992/1994), DP complements are available for the relevant predicates.

3.1 (Non)-expletive behavior

The main argument of Tóth (2000) and Rákosi & Laczkó (2005)'s main argument is that the pronouns does not behave like regular expletives, as described in the previous section. They can occur in "peripheral positions": they may be questioned, focussed or quantified. Furthermore, given the proper discourse-context,¹⁰ they may be replaced with the proximal counterpart.

- (13) a *Mit* *mondott* *Mari*?
 what.ACC said.3SG Mary
 'What did Mary say?'
- b *CSAK AZT mondtad, hogy János fog győzni. (Azt nem, hogy ennyire fölényesen)*
 only that.ACC said.2SG that(C) John AUX win.INF
 'You only said that John will win. (And not that he will do so by such a large margin.)'
- c *Azt is mondtad, hogy a verseny után elmegyük ünnepelni.*
 that.ACC too said that(C) the race after go.1PL celebrate.INF
 'You also said that after the competition, we'll go to celebrate.'
- d *Én is ezt mondom, hogy János fog nyerni.*
 I too this.ACC say.1SG that(C) John AUX win
 'I also say that John will win.'

Also, as noted, expletives cross-linguistically occur only as subjects, while for example in (13), *azt* clearly functions as an object. However, Kenesei (1994: 324) proposes that the reason for this state of affairs is that expletives behave in different ways in typologically different languages. The aforementioned restriction (barring peripheral and nonsubject positions) holds in configurational languages like English. In such languages expletives really serve as fillers for specific syntactic slots (Spec, TP/IP). In discourse-configurational languages, including Hungarian, they have a different role: they represent clauses in positions

¹⁰ Intuitively, this seems to be related to the proposition's givenness in the discourse.

which are unavailable for the clauses themselves.¹¹ The positions in (13b-c) are indeed unsuitable for *that*(C)-clauses in Hungarian.

- (14) a **Csak hogy János fog győzni mondtad.*
 b **Hogy a verseny után elmegyünk ünnepelni is mondtad.*

While the data in (14) may be explained along the line of Kenesei's (1992/1994) typological reasoning, the alternative theory is not excluded by it: Hungarian may also utilize another strategy (real pronoun + adjunction/complex NP-formation) to bypass the restriction illustrated in (14), without the postulation of a new kind of expletive. In other words, the data in (14) is not conclusive, as it can be interpreted from both analytical perspectives.

It can be added at this point that Kenesei's (1992/1994) typological generalization seems not to be very well supported by cross-linguistic data. Although there is a considerable body of research about non-configurational languages (e.g. see É. Kiss (1995)), to my best knowledge, no other language exhibits the pattern proposed by Kenesei (1992/1994). For instance, Finnish, a language related to Hungarian (which is also discourse-configurational), has an expletive which behaves in an entirely orthodox way: according to Nikanne & Holmberg (2002), the pronoun *sitä* must be inserted to Spec,TP (and to nowhere else) if nothing else occupies it (15c). No object-expletives are reported in Finnish.

- (15) a *Minulle sattui onnettomuus.* (Finnish)
 to-me happened accident
 'An accident happened to me.'
 b **Sattui minulle onnettomuus.*
 c *Sitä sattui minulle onnettomuus.*

Other non-configurational languages to my knowledge either have no expletives or they have expletives that behave much like English expletives do.

Furthermore, Hungarian has another candidate for an element being expletive-like. Some verbs associate the pronoun *úgy* ('so.DIST') with their subordinate clause. The Hungarian equivalent of *seem* is one such verb. Here, *úgy* behaves just like English expletives: it cannot be questioned, focussed, or quantified and it also cannot be omitted. As no other subject is allowed in a sentence like (16f) it is also most probably the subject of the sentence.

- (16) a *Úgy tűnik, hogy János fog nyerni.*
 so.DIST seems that(C) John AUX win.INF
 'It seems that John will win.' Lit.: 'So seems that John will win.'
 b **Hogy tűnik János?*
 how seems John
 c **CSAK ÚGY tűnik, hogy János fog nyerni, (és nem úgy, hogy Péter).*
 intended: 'What seems is that John will win, not that Peter will do so.'

¹¹ According to Kenesei (1992: 657-661/1994: 331-332), the source of the restriction is phonological.

- d *Úgy tűnik, hogy érdekes lesz a verseny. *Ezenkívül úgy is tűnik, hogy János fog nyerni.*
 intended: 'It seems that the competition will be interesting. What also seems is that John will win.'
- e **Tűnik, hogy János fog nyerni.*
- f **János úgy tűnik, hogy ő fog nyerni.*
 John so.DIST seems that(C) he AUX win.INF

This form of this pronoun (formally, it's also a distal demonstrative) seems to be unaffected by discourse considerations (mentioned at (4)), so the proximal counterpart is always quite degraded, even in contexts that otherwise license the use of *ezt* in (13d).

- (17) *???Nekem is így tűnik hogy János fog nyerni.*
 me.DAT too so.PROX seems that(C) John AUX win.INF
 'It seems to me too that John will win.'

It should be noted that some verbs (e.g. *gondol* 'think') which occur with the object accusative pronoun *azt*, can also alternatively select *úgy*. These verbs show a mixed behavior on the tests used in (13). On the one hand, they may be questioned or be replaced with a proximal counterpart *így*. On the other hand, focussing and quantifying are still ungrammatical. I remain neutral on the proper line of analysis in these cases.

- (18) a *Azt/úgy gondolom, hogy János fog győzni.*
 that.acc so.DIST think.1SG that(C) John AUX win.INF
 'I think that John will win.'
- b *Te hogy gondolod?*
 you how think.2SG
 'What do you think?' Lit.: 'How do you think?'
- c **CSAK ÚGY gondolom, hogy János fog győzni, úgy nem, hogy nagy fölényel.*
 intended: I think that John will win, and not that he will do so by a large margin.'
- d *Úgy gondolom, hogy érdekes lesz a verseny. *Úgy is gondolom, hogy János fog győzni.*
 intended: I think that the race will be interesting. What I also think is that John will win.'
- e *Én is így gondolom, hogy János fog győzni.*

Another problem with the expletive analysis of the pronouns is that they occurs not only as grammatical functions associated with structural case (subject, object), but also as complements of predicates assigning inherent case. This is problematic for an expletive-analysis regardless of one's theoretical persuasion, even if one allows for object-expletives (like the ones mentioned in connection with sentences like (7) and (9)). Inherent case is

always associated with the idiosyncratic meaning of the predicate.¹² Moreover, the CP-complements of such predicates are always replaceable with case-marked DPs. As we will see, The apparent lack of such DPs in the case of subject and object pronouns is one of Kenesei's (1992/1994) main arguments for the expletive-analysis, so their systematic availability is surprising for such an approach. This had led Lipták (1998), who otherwise subscribes to the expletive-analysis in the case of nominative and accusative pronouns, to abandon this aspect of Kenesei's theory and refer to such inherently case-marked pronouns as "argumental referring words".

- (19) a *János büszke volt arra, hogy győzött.*
 John proud was that.onto that(C) won.3SG
 'John was proud that he had won.'
- b *János büszke volt a győzelmére.*
 John proud was the victory.POSS.3SG.onto
 'John was proud of his victory.'
- (20) a *János attól tartott, hogy veszít.*
 John that.from was.afraid that(C) loses
 'John was afraid that he might lose.'
- b *János a vereségétől tartott.*
 John the defeat.POSS.3SG.from was.afraid
 'John was afraid of his (possible) defeat.'

3.2 The distribution of DPs and CPs

As already noted, according to Kenesei (1992/1994), verbs taking a subordinate clause in Hungarian strictly subcategorize for a CP as the realization of their propositional argument. Kenesei supports this view with examples like (21-24), in which replacing the CP with a synonymous DP results in ungrammaticality.

- (21) a *(Az) szerencse volt, hogy idejekorán vettek fel kölcsönt.*
 that luck was that(C) in.time bought.3PL up loan.ACC
 'It was lucky that they had taken out a loan in time.'
- b **A kölcsön felvétele szerencse volt.*¹³
 the loan taking.out luck was
 '*Taking out the loan was luck.'

¹² Chomsky (1986) formulates this as the Inherent case condition: if A is an inherent case assigner, then A assigns case to an NP if and only if A theta-marks the NP.

¹³ As pointed out by my reviewer, (21b) is much better if a more faithful paraphrase of (21a) is used:

i) *A kölcsön idejekorán való felvétele szerencse volt.*
 the loan in.time being taking.out luck was
 'Taking out the loan in time was luck.'

According to Laczkó (1995), the main function of *való* is to mark complex events. How exactly this is related to the acceptability of nominal subjects for *szerencse* remains a target for future research.

- (22) a (Az) *jó volt, hogy már tegnap megérkeztetek.*
 that good was that(C) already yesterday arrived.2PL
 ‘It was good that you had already arrived yesterday.’
- b #A *tegnapi megérkezésetek jó volt.*
 the yesterday arrival.POSS.2PL good was
 ‘*Your arriving yesterday was good.’
- (23) a *Mari azt hitte, hogy jókor szólalt meg.*
 Mary that.ACC believed.3SG that(C) at.a.good.time spoke PV
 ‘Mary believed that she had spoken at the right time.’
- b **Mari a jókori megszólalást hitte.*
 Mary the at.a.good.time speaking believed.3SG
 ‘*Mary believed the at-the-good-time speaking.’
- (24) a *Azt mondta, hogy tudja a választ.*
 that.ACC said.3SG that(C) knows the answer.
 ‘S/he said that s/he knew the answer.’
- b **A válasz tudását mondta.*
 the answer knowing.ACC said.3SG
 ‘*He said the knowing of the answer.’

I would like to argue while there are certain restrictions indeed, the generalization as a whole does not hold water. My first observation is that even in Kenesei’s original examples some judgments are debatable. For instance, a web-search results in several examples where *szerencse* takes a DP subject.

- (25) a *Merkel: micsoda szerencse volt a békés kelet-európai rendszerváltás.*
 Merkel: what luck was the peaceful eastern.Europe change.of.system
 ‘Merkel: what a luck was the peaceful change of the political system in Eastern Europe.’
 from: http://hvg.hu/vilag/20140227_Merkel_micsoda_szerencse_volt_a_bekes_ke
- b *Óriási szerencse volt számunkra a PC-k gyors elterjedése.*
 huge luck was for.us the PC-PL fast spread.poss.3PL
 The PCs fast spread of the PCs was a huge luck for us.
 from: Hungarian National Corpus
- c *Szerinte inkább véletlen szerencse volt a gép lelövése.*
 according.to.him/her rather random luck was the plane
 shooting
 ‘According to him, the plane’s shooting down was sheer luck.’
 from: Hungarian National Corpus

Another verb that may have CP or a subject pronoun DP complement is *fontos* (‘important).

- (26) a (Az) *fontos (az), hogy János győzött.*
 that important that that(C) John won.3SG
 ‘It’s important that John won.’

- b *Fontos János győzelme.*
 Important John victory.POSS.3SG
 ‘John’s victory is important.’

Additionally, (27)-(33) represents the capacity of other subordinating verbs taking CPs and object pronoun DPs alternatively.

- (27) a *A miniszter azt fontolgatja, hogy lemond.*
 the minister that.ACC contemplate.3SG that(C) resign.3SG
 ‘The minister is contemplating that he may resign.’
- b *A miniszter fontolgatja a lemondást.*
 the minister contemplate.3SG the resignation
 ‘The minister is contemplating about resignation.’
- (28) a *Azt jósolom, hogy János fog nyerni.*
 that.ACC predict.1SG that(C) John AUX win.INF
 ‘I predict that John will win.’
- b *János győzelmét jósolom.*
 John victory.POSS.3SG.ACC predict
 ‘I predict John’s victory.’
- (29) a *Valótlanul állítottuk azt, hogy jó idő lesz.*
 wrongly claimed.1PL that that(C) good weather be.FUT
 ‘We wrongly claimed that there will be good weather.’
- b *Valótlanul állítottuk a jó időt.*
 wrongly claimed.1PL the good weather.ACC
 ‘We wrongly claimed that there will be good weather.’ Lit: ‘We wrongly claimed good weather.’
 from: http://index.hu/belfold/2015/05/27/idojaras_elorejelzes_meteorologia/
- (30) a *Azt javasolja az orvos, hogy sokat mozogjak.*
 that.ACC recommend.3PL the doctor that lot move.IMP.1SG
 The doctor recommended that I exercise a lot.’
- b *Az orvos sok mozgást javasol.*
 the doctor lot movement.ACC recommed.3SG
 ‘The doctor recommends a lot of exercise.’
- (31) a *Furcsállom azt, hogy János vesztt.*
 find.strange.1SG that.ACC that(C) John lost.3SG
 ‘I find it strange that John had lost.’
- b *Furcsállom János vereségét.*
 find.strange.2SG John defeat.POSS.3SG.ACC
 ‘I find John’s defeat strange.’
- (32) a *Azt firtatta, hogy miért távoztam korán.*
 that.ACC asked.3SG that(C) why left.1SG early
 ‘S/he pumped me for why I had left early.’

- b *A korai távozásom okát firtatta.*
 the early leave.poss.1SG reason.POSS.3SG.ACC asked.3SG
 ‘S/he pumped me for the reason of me leaving early.’
- (33) a *Azt sérelmezem, hogy korán távoztatok.*
 that.ACC resent.1SG that(C) early left.2PL
 ‘I resent that you had left early.’
- b *Sérelmezem a korai távozásotokat.*
 resent.1SG the early leave.POSS.2PL.ACC
 ‘I resent you leaving early.’

It is true that *mond* (‘say’) or *hisz* (‘believe’), two prominent subordinating verbs are not grammatical with an object that is the result of a nominalization of a clause, like in (23) and (24), but in the light of (27)-(33) that seems to be a lexical restriction on them, rather than a substantive generalization. Besides, *mond* is capable of taking DP objects, if these are not clause-nominalizations, but simple nouns with a propositional-like meaning.

- (34) *Mondott nekem egy viccet/ hírt/ történetet/ három dolgot.*
 said.3sg me.dat one joke news story three things
 ‘S/he told me a joke/ a piece of news/ story/ three things.’

One might argue that (34) represents another lexical entry. However, I think it is not the case. The objects in (34) are manifestations of the same object function that can also be fulfilled by the pronoun. Evidence for this comes from coordination facts.

To understand the reasoning, let’s take the English verb *believe* as an example. It can occur with a thematic object as in (35a) or a nonthematic one, as in (35b) ((35b) is a so-called “raising-to-object” sentence.)

- (35) a *I believe the story.*
 b *I believe John to be happy.*

Although both sentences contain an object, the two cannot be mixed, so the objects cannot be coordinated. This is easily explained if we assume that one cannot “mix” the objects of two different lexical entries.

- (36) a **I believe the story and John to be happy.*

With this in mind, let’s take a look at *mond* and *hisz*. *They* also have a usage like *believe* in (35b), where they take a nonthematic object and a nonfinite complement.

- (37) *Jánost mindenki okosnak mondja/hiszi.*
 John.ACC everyone smart.DAT say.3SG believe.3SG
 ‘John is said/believes to be smart by everyone’ Lit.: ‘Everyone says/believes John to be smart.’

What I propose is that while the usage in (37) indeed represents a separate lexical entry (which is like (35b)), an object like in (34) and a pronoun in a subordinating sentence are

manifestations of the object function of the same lexical entry, which is like the one used in (35a).

Thus, I expect that the object of (34) and a pronoun-clause complex can be coordinated, but an object like in (37) and a single DP or a pronoun-clause complex cannot. This prediction is borne out, see (38a). Similar sentences may be constructed about the other examples in (27)-(33).¹⁴

- (38) a *Tomi éppen mondta a viccet és azt, hogy hol hallotta,*
 Tom just said.3SG the joke.ACC and that that(C) where heard.3SG
amikor elment az áram.
 when away.went the electricity
 ‘Tom was telling the joke and telling about where he heard it, when a power outage occurred.’
- b *Fontos János győzelme és az, hogy ez őt boldoggá*
 important John victory.POSS.1SG and that that(C) this him happy
teszi.
 makes.3SG
 ‘John’s victory and that this makes him happy is important.’
- c *Valótlanul állítottuk a jó időt és azt, hogy lehet*
 wrongly claimed.1PL the good weather and that.ACC that(C) possible
majd kirándulni.
 then make.a.trip
 ‘We wrongly claimed that there will be a good weather and that one can make a trip.’
- d *Fontolgom a visszavonulásomat és azt, hogy*
 contemplate.1SG the resignation.POSS.1SG.ACC and that.ACC that(C)
ezt holnap teszem meg.
 this.ACC tomorrow do pv
 ‘I’m contemplating about my resignation and that I do it tomorrow.’
- e *Furcsállom János vereségét, és azt, hogy ez*
 find.strange.1SG John defeat.POSS.3SG.ACC and that.ACC that(C) this
mintha nem is érdekelné.
 as.if not even interest.COND.3SG
 ‘I find John’s defeat and that it doesn’t seem to bother him strange.’

¹⁴ My reviewer has observed that the demonstrative pronouns in (38) are omissible. In that case, it would seem that an NP and a CP are coordinated. Although such state of affairs is unexpected under an orthodox view of coordination, where only constituents of the same type can be coordinated, such a view is clearly oversimplified. For example in LFG, coordination is not based on matching phrasal category but on grammatical function, thus accounting for sentences like *Pat remembered [the appointment] and [that it was important to be on time]* (from Sag et al. 1985: 165), where both conjuncts bear the object function.

The situation is similar in (38): the verb subcategorizes for an object, which may be realized by the pronoun or, if there is no pronoun, a clause. (For more on clausal objects, see Dalrymple and Lodrup (2000)).

- f *Sérelmezem a korai távozásotokat és azt, hogy nem is köszöntetek el.*
 resent.1SG the early leave.POSS.2PL and that.ACC that(C) not even
 greeted.2PL away
 ‘I resent you leaving early and that you hadn’t even said goodbye.’¹⁵

On the other hand, the lexical entry illustrated in (37) cannot be coordinated with either a pronoun-clause complex or a simple DP object. (39) illustrates this with several word-order permutations.

- (39) a **Jánost okosnak és azt mondtam, hogy győzni fog.*
 John.ACC smart.DAT and that.ACC said.1SG that(C) win.INF AUX
- b **A viccet/ hírt/ történetet és Jánost okosnak mondtam.*
 the joke.ACC news.ACC story.ACC and John.ACC smart.DAT said.2SG
- c **Okosnak Jánost és a viccet mondtam.*
 smart.DAT John.ACC and the joke.ACC said.1SG

As for *hisz* (‘believe’), it is not really productive in contemporary Hungarian with a simple DP object.¹⁶ However, in an artistic/archaic style, it is capable of taking a DP object (40a-b). Occasionally, one can come across contemporary examples as well, showing that the structure is not entirely obsolete (40c). If one is willing to take these archaic/artistic examples into consideration, *hisz* behaves exactly like *mond* (38a) and (39): the single DP object can coordinate with a pronoun-clause complex but the athematic object cannot, see (41).

- (40) a ?*Apám hitte a szavak igazát.*
 father.POSS.1SG believed.3SG the word truth.ACC
 ‘My father believed (in) the words’ truth.
 from a Hungarian popsong, <http://www.zeneszoveg.hu/dalszoveg/173/zoran/apam-hitte-zeneszoveg.html>
- b ?*Hiszem a római katolikus anyaszentegyházat.*
 believe.1SG the roman catholic holy.church.ACC
 ‘I believe (in) the the Holy Catholic Church’
 from: the Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church
 (http://www.vatican.va/archive/compendium_ccc/documents/archive_2005_compendium-ccc_hu.html)

¹⁵ My reviewer also points out that in Kenesei’s (1992: 605) tree-structure, the pronoun and the clause do not form a constituent, whereas it can be shown with the diagnostics offered by Alberti et al. (2015) that they do.

i) *Na például azt, hogy honnan tudja a viccet, egyedül János mondta el.*
 for example that that(C) where.from knows the joke alone John said.3SG away.
 ‘For example that from where he knows the joke only John told us.’

However, in Lipták (1998), which utilizes an updated version of Kenesei’s (1992/1994) framework, this problem is no longer present. Because of this, and also because of the lack of explicit phrase-structural proposal on my part at this point, I am reluctant to use this argument as support for my case.

¹⁶ *Hisz* (‘believe’) is much more productive if combined with the preverb *el* (‘away’). However, as preverbs can significantly alter the verb’s behavior, such examples are not taken into consideration.

- c *Hiszem Isten jóságát.*
 believe God goodness.ACC
 ‘I believe (in) God’s goodness.’
 from: interview with Géza Röhrig in *Heti Válasz* (Hungarian political magazine), 2015-June-18.
- (41) a *Hiszem apám igazát / Isten jóságát és azt, hogy*
 believe.1SG father.POSS.1SG truth God goodness.ACC and that that(C)
ez a helyes cselekedet.
 this the right deed
 ‘I believe my father’s truth and that that(C) this is the right deed.
- b **Jánost okosnak és apám igazát/ Isten jóságát hittem.*

If we take another perspective on subordinating structures, it can be argued that the landscape of pronoun-distribution is more complex than the picture presented in Kenesei (1992/1994). Apart from the cases that have been discussed so far, where a DP and a CP complement alternates, there are predicates which can never occur with a pronoun, only with a clause. Such predicates are plausibly analyzed as subcategorizing for CPs. However, here the expletive-contentful pronoun question does not arise in the first place. *Muszáj* (‘must’) is a one-place predicate of this kind, while *szól* (‘tell’) is a two-place one. (*Muszáj* is mentioned in Kálmán (2001: 170), about *szól*, see Jánosi (2013: 61)).

- (42) a *(*Az) muszáj (*az), hogy elgyere.*¹⁷
 that must that that(C) come.2SG.SUBJUNCTIVE
 ‘It is a must that you come.’
- b *Szólt, hogy sikerült a vizsga.*
 told.2SG that succeeded the exam
 ‘S/he told us that s/he had passed the exam.’
- c *(*Azt) szólta (*azt), hogy sikerült a vizsga.*

With other predicates, the pronoun is optional but its presence or absence clearly modifies the meaning of the sentence. *Van* (‘be’) is one such predicate: without *az*, the sentence has an existential reading, with it, the sentence describes a particular situation.

- (43) a *Van, hogy János győz.*
 be that(C) John wins
 ‘It happens that John wins.’
- b *Az van, hogy János győzött.*
 that be that(C) John won.2SG
 ‘The situation is that John won.’

If the presence of *az* causes such a difference in meaning, it is unlikely that it should be analyzed as an expletive. If *az* in (43b) is not an expletive, we then expect it to behave like normal pronouns and unlike expletives. This prediction is born out: a direct question, using

¹⁷ The availability of the pronoun could be improved by negating the sentences, though judgments are not clear.

the corresponding question word, *mit* ('what') can only be formed about (43b), and not (43a). That is, only (44/A1) is a proper response to (44/Q).

- (44) Q: *Mi van?*
 what be
 A1: *Az van, hogy János győzött.*
 A2: *#Van, hogy János győz.*

Interestingly, *úgy*, an element which I have argued to behave much like ordinary expletives, can follow the existential sense of *van*: (45) is synonymous with (43a). Then, as expected if *úgy* is an expletive, no question can be formulated about it, see (46).

- (45) *Van úgy, hogy János győz.*
 be so.DIST that(C) John wins.
 'It happens that John wins.'
- (46) **Hogy van?*
 how be

What this could mean that there are two separate lexical entries for *van*, one which subcategorizes for a CP (as in Kenesei's (1992/1994) proposal), and a separate one that accepts a regular DP subject (which can be the demonstrative pronoun *az*). So there is no "division of labor" between the clause and the pronoun: *van* in (44/A2) takes the clause as a subject and no expletive is needed in the structure. This situation is similar to the one with *szól* in (42b), where the clause satisfies the subcategorization requirements of the predicate, without the help of an expletive. In both cases, inserting a pronoun like *az* is impossible. From this perspective, the main difference between *van* and *szól* is that *van* has an alternative lexical entry (with a different meaning), which takes a DP subject, which seemingly saves the sentence. However, in reality, it is not saved, but another construction is used.¹⁸

Consequently, would like to argue that Kenesei's (1992/1994) proposal, which is based on the apparent scarcity of DP complements of subordinating verbs, cannot be maintained. As the typological picture seems to weigh rather against than for the expletive-analysis of the pronouns in question, I conclude that an alternative theory, where these demonstratives (*az* and its variants) are referring, is indeed to be preferred.

4 Complex NP-formation vs. adjunction

In É. Kiss's (2002) version of this approach, the pronoun and the clause form a complex noun phrase. Although it is not stated explicitly, most probably É. Kiss assumes that the pronoun-clause is base-generated postverbally and the pronoun may be moved to preverbal operator positions afterwards. This framework predicts that "movement" out of subordinate clauses is

¹⁸ Alrenga (2005) uses a similar argumentation to distinguish between two senses of *appear*. For example, *appear* in (ia) is synonymous with *seem*, while in (ib) it means approximately "became visible".

i) a *It appears that John will win.*
 b *The sun appeared on the horizon.*

ungrammatical since complex noun phrases are islands (this is Ross's (1967) Complex Noun Phrase Constraint).

What is problematic about this account is that (as É. Kiss (2002) herself acknowledges) it cannot straightforwardly account for cases when "movement" does take place, namely, when the pronoun is not explicitly present (47b,d).

- (47) a **János mondtad azt, hogy jön.*
 John said.2SG that.ACC that(C) comes
- b *János mondtad, hogy jön.*
 John said.2SG that(C) comes
 'John you said that he will come.'
- (48) a **Mitől mondtad azt, hogy fél János?*
 what.from said.2SG that.ACC that(C) fears John?
- b *Mitől mondtad, hogy fél János?*
 what.from said.2sg that(C) fears John?
 'What did you say that John fears?'

To overcome this problem, É. Kiss (2002: 253) has to stipulate "that a projection containing no phonologically realized material is transparent for subjacency. Then the noun phrase subsuming the argument clause would activate the CNPC only when its nominal head is spelled out phonologically."

As already mentioned, this kind of data is also problematic for Kenesei's (1992/1994) theory, and for a similar reason: while É. Kiss stipulates an empty head in (51b), Kenesei posits that it is occupied by an expletive *pro*. In a Chomskyan framework, this would mean that the extraction possibilities are determined only at PF (den Dikken 2010, footnote 6). Without further elaboration, such an approach is unprecedented and thus has reduced plausibility.¹⁹

There is no need for such stipulations in the proposal of Tóth I. (2002), to which Rákosi & Laczkó (2005) also subscribes. In these frameworks, a verb like *mond* takes a simple DP object, and the clause itself is an adjunct. (47a) follows, since adjuncts are also islands. This is attested in Hungarian as well.

- (49) a *Jöttem, hogy János lásson engem is.*
 came.1SG that(C) John see.SUBJUNCTIVE.3SG me too.
 'I came so that John can see me too.'
- b **János jöttem, hogy lásson engem is.*
 John came.1SG that(C) see.SUBJUNCTIVE.3SG me too
- c **Kit jöttél, hogy lásson János?*
 whom came.2sg that(c) see.SUBJUNCTIVE.3SG John
 intended: 'Whom did you come so that John can see?'

¹⁹ It might be added that according to Holmberg (2005) „expletive *pro* is a dubious category, particularly in a Minimalist framework, as it has no interface properties at all, neither at LF not PF.”

pronoun is optional, but when it is present, it blocks “extraction” out of the embedded clause (52b).

- (52) a *weil er (es) gesagt hat, dass Hans krank ist*
 because he it said have that(C) Hans ill is
 ‘because he said that Hans is ill.’
- b *Was hat er (*es) gesagt, dass er gelesen hat?*
 what has he it said that he read has
 ‘What did he say that he read?’

Finally, the object pronouns in (7) which were claimed to be expletives by Postal and Pullum (1988) but are argued to be real pronouns by Rothstein (1995) also show this pattern. This provides support Rothstein’s account.

- (53) a *What do you believe (*it) that John will do?*
- b *A full compensation, I strongly demand (*it) that I get.*

In summary, I have argued that the optional *az* pronoun (and its case-marked and deictic variants) in Hungarian sentences with subordinate clauses should receive an analysis where they are contentful pronouns (demonstratives), and not expletives. This approach is preferable on theoretical, empirical and cross-linguistic grounds as well. The pronouns in question do not behave as expletives do: they occur in operator positions and have a non-fixed form. Putting them into a special category of expletives is not really explanatory since the lack of examples from other languages would cause Hungarian to be the sole member of this group, where this kind of expletives are to be found. Also, another pronoun, *úgy* behaves much like ordinary expletives, posing a challenge for accounts which make it a matter of parametric variation what kind of expletives occur in a language. On the other hand, the real pronoun analysis can describe the same range of data and it also receives support from the fact that these pronouns are often replaceable with contentful DPs. Such a pattern is documented cross-linguistically, further increasing the plausibility of the account.

What seems to be special about Hungarian is that it allows the realization of propositional arguments with pronouns across the board, while other languages appear to be more restricted. The reason for this difference remains an issue for future research.

References

- Alba-Salas, J. (2004): Lexically selected expletives: evidence from Basque and Romance. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 17, 35-100.
- Alberti, G., Farkas, J. & Szabó, V. (2015): Arguments for Arguments in the Complement Zone of the Hungarian Nominal Head. In: É. Kiss, K., Surányi, B. & Dékány, É. (eds.): *Approaches to Hungarian – Volume 14: Papers from the 2013 Piliscsaba Conference*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 5-36.
- Alrenga, P. (2005): A sentential subject asymmetry in English and its implications for complement selection. *Syntax* 8(3), 175-207.
- Bennis, H. (1986): *Gaps and dummies*. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Berman, J. (2001): On the cooccurrence of *es* with finite clause in German: an LFG analysis. In: Meurers, Walt D. & Kiss, T. (eds.): *Constraint-Based Approaches to Germanic Syntax*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 7-30.
- Cardinaletti, A. & Starke, M. (1994): The typology of structural deficiency. On the three grammatical classes. *University Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 4, 41-109.
- Chomsky, N. (1981): *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1986): *Knowledge of Language, its Nature, Origin, and Use*. New York: Praeger.
- Dalrymple, M. & Helge, L. (2000): The grammatical functions of complement clauses. In: Butt, M. & King, T.H. (eds.): *Proceedings of the LFG00 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 104-121.
- Den Dikken, M. (2010): *On the strategies for forming long A'-dependencies: Evidence from Hungarian*. Manuscript. CUNY Graduate Centre.
- É. Kiss, K. (ed.) (1995): *Discourse Configurational Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- É. Kiss, K. (1998): Identificational Focus versus Information Focus. *Language* 74, 245-273.
- É. Kiss, K. (2002): *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grimshaw, J. (1982): Subcategorization and grammatical relations. In: Zaenen, A.: *Subjects and other subjects: Proceedings of the Harvard Conference on the Representation of Grammatical Relations*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club, 35-55.
- Hedberg, N. (2000): The referential status of clefts. *Language* 76, 891-920.
- Hoekstra, T. (1983): The distribution of sentential complements. In: Bennis, H. & van Lessen Kloeke, W. (eds.): *Linguistics in the Netherlands*. Dordrecht: Foris, 93-103.
- Holmberg, A. & Nikanne, U. (2002): Expletives, Subjects, and Topics in Finnish. In: Svenonius, P. (ed.): *Subjects, expletives and the EPP*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 71-115.
- Holmberg, A. (2005): Is there a little pro? Evidence from Finnish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(4), 533-564.
- Jánosi, A. (2013): *Long Split Focus Constructions in Hungarian with a view on speaker variation*. Doctoral dissertation. CRISP.
- Laczkó, T. (1995): On the status of *való* in adjectivalized constituents in noun-phrases. In: Kenesei, István (ed.): *Approaches to Hungarian – Volume 5: Levels and Structures*. Szeged: JATE, 125-152.
- Lipták A. (1998): A magyar fókuszemelések egy minimalista elemzése. In: Büky L. & Maleczki M. (szerk.): *A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb módszerei 3*. Szeged: University of Szeged, 93-116.
- Kálmán L. (szerk.) (2001): *Leiró magyar nyelvtan: Mondattan I*. Budapest: MTA-ELTE.
- Kenesei I. (1992): Az alárendelt mondatok szerkezete. In: Kiefer F. (szerk.): *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan II.: Mondattan*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 529-714.

- Kenesei, I. (1994): Subordinate clauses. In Kiefer, F. & É. Kiss, K. (eds.): *The syntactic structure of Hungarian*. San Diego: Academic Press, 141-165.
- Manzini, R.M. (2014): Grammatical categories: Strong and weak pronouns in Romance. *Lingua* 150, 171-201.
- Moro, A. (1997): *The raising of predicates*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pesetsky, D. (1993): Topic...comment. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 11, 557-558.
- Postal, P.M. & Geoffrey K.P. (1988): Expletive Noun Phrases in Subcategorized Positions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 635-670.
- Rákosi, Gy. & Laczkó, T. (2005): Verbal Category and Nominal Function – Evidence from Hungarian Subject Clauses. In: Butt, M. & King, T.H. (eds.): *Proceedings of the LFG05 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 353-370.
- Ross, J.R. (1967): *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Doctoral dissertation. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Rothstein, S.D. (1995): Pleonastics and the interpretation of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 499-529.
- Sag, I.A., Gazdar, G., Wasow, T. & Weisler S. (1985): Coordination and How to Distinguish Categories. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3, 117-171.
- Tortora, C.M. (1997): *The syntax and semantics of the weak locative*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Delaware.
- Tóth I. (2000): *Inflected Infinitives in Hungarian*. Tilburg: TILDIL Dissertation Series.

Péter Szűcs
 University of Debrecen
 Institute of English and American Studies
 Pf. 400
 H-4002 Debrecen
 szucspeter.uni@gmail.com