

The (X)COMP debate

a) Do we need COMP?

- Dalrymple & Lødrup 2000: yes, CPs may be COMPs or OBJs.
- Alsina et al. (2005): no, CPs may be OBJs or OBL_os (or OBJ_os?).
- See also: Forst (2006) – no, Lødrup (2012) – yes, Patejuk & Przepiórkowski (2016) – no, Belyaev et al. (2017) – yes.

b) Do we need XCOMP?

- Alsina et al. (2005): no, XCOMP is just a special, functionally controlled COMP.
 - A new theory of LMT and functional control is needed (see e.g. Alsina (2008)).
- Falk (2005): yes and also other open complements to model GF-category correlations:
 - CP, S, IP → COMP; InfP → XCOMP (InfP ≡ VP, IP, CP – depending on the analysis); NP, DP → SUBJ, OBJ; PP → OBL
 - It is possible for a language not to have +c functions, e.g. Norwegian.
 - The +c row is problematic (why only +r?, why unspecified for o?).

KEY POINTS

- There is a debate in LFG about the necessity of the COMP and XCOMP functions: as far as Hungarian is concerned, they are not needed.
- Both finite and nonfinite complement clauses are amenable to analyses in terms of other GFs.
- The analysis of complement GFs is framed in Falk's (2005) approach but it is possible that a more stripped-down inventory of GFs is preferable in the long run.

		-r	+r	
		+s		-s
-c	-o	SUBJ	OBL _o	XOBL _o
	+o	OBJ	OBJ _o	XOBJ _o
+c	+/-o		COMP	XCOMP

GFs in Falk (2005).
r: restricted, o: object-like
c: complement, s: saturated

My goal here is not to decide the (X)COMP debate, but to add a Hungarian perspective to it.

The claim is that Hungarian is also like Norwegian, a language without +c functions. Whether the -s functions are needed in the long run is another question.

Hungarian complement clauses – equi and without control

Complementation possibilities:

a) Lexical noun b) pronoun* c) that(c)-clause* d) infinitive → all of these may be analyzed as having uniform GFs

(1) a. *Az igazság kellemetlen volt Katinak.*
the truth unpleasant was Kati.DAT
'The truth was unpleasant for Kate.'

SUBJ b-c. *(Az) kellemetlen volt Katinak, hogy bevallotta az igazságot.*
that.NOM unpleasant was Kate.DAT that(c) admitted the truth.ACC
'It was unpleasant for Kate that she admitted truth.'

d. *Katinak kellemetlen volt bevallani az igazságot.*
Kate.DAT unpleasant was admit-INF the truth
'To admit the truth was unpleasant for Kate.'

(2) a. *Kati ételt akar.*
Kate food.ACC wants
'Kate wants food.'

OBJ b-c. *Kati (azt) akarja, hogy együnk.* d. *Kati enni akar.*
Kate that.ACC wants that(c) eat.SBJV Kate eat-INF wants
approx. 'Kate wants (it) that we eat.' 'Kate wants to eat.'

(3) a. *Kati fél az igazságtól.*
Kate fears the truth.from
'Kate fears the truth.'

OBL_o b-c. *Kati (attól) fél, hogy kiderül az igazság.*
Kate that.from fears that(c) comes.out the truth.
Kate fears that the truth comes out.'

d. *Kati fél elmondani az igazságot.*
Kate fears tell-INF the truth
'Kate fears to tell the truth.'

*If no pronoun is present, the clause is the SUBJ/OBJ/OBL argument of the main verb. If there is a pronoun, it is the argument and the clause is an adjunct to it. See Rákosi & Laczkó (2005).

Hungarian complements clauses – raising

- Correlations in Falk (2005): InfP → XCOMP AP, NP → XOBJ_o PP → XOBL_o
- InfP is quite restricted in Hungarian raising and it is never the only option → XCOMP is not needed.

(4) a. **Kati okos lenni látszik.* b. **Kati az okos lánynak látszik.*
Kate smart be.INF seems Kate the smart girl-DAT seems
'Kate seems to be smart.' → *InfP 'Kate seems to be Ann.' → *referential NP

c. *Kati okos-nak látszik.* d. *Kati okos lány-nak látszik.*
Kate smart-DAT seems Kate smart girl-DAT seems
'Kate seems nice.' → AP 'Kate seems (like) a smart girl.' → predicative NP

XOBJ_o d. *Katit elnökké nyilvánították.*
Kate.ACC president.TR declared.3PL
'They declared Kate president.' → oblique NP

- PPs are also not possible as raising complements → XOBL_o is not needed.

(5) a. **Kati magán kívül látszik.* b. **Katit magán kívül nyilvánították.*
John herself outside seems Kate.ACC herself outside declared.3PL
Intended: 'Kate seems out of her mind.' Intended: 'They declared Kate out of her mind.'

- → Hungarian raising seems to rely on XOBJ_o

Obligatory anaphoric control into SUBJ in Hungarian

Rákosi (2006:212)

(i) *It was unpleasant for Kate [for Peter to admit the truth].*

(ii) **Kellemetlen volt Katinak [Péternek bevallania az igazságot].*
unpleasant was Kati.DAT Peter.DAT admit.INF.3SG the truth.ACC

Overt pronominal infinitival SUBJs are possible (Szabolcsi (2009)).

(iii) *Kellemetlen volt Katinak, [csak neki, / *csak Péternek] hazamennie.*
unpleasant was Kate.DAT only she.DAT only Peter.DAT go.home.INF.3SG
'It was unpleasant for Kate only for her to go home.'

OBJ vs. OBL_o infinitivals

Szécsényi & Szécsényi (2017), only OBJ triggers (long) definiteness agreement.

(i) *Kati akar / akarja [OBJ olvasni [OBJ egy könyvet / a könyvet]].*
Kate wants.INDEF / wants.DEF.3SG read.INF a book.ACC the book.ACC
'Kate wants to read [a book/ the book].'

(ii) *Kati fél / *féli [OBL olvasni [OBJ egy könyvet / a könyvet]].*
Kate fears.INDEF fears.DEF.3SG read.INF a book.ACC the book.ACC
'Kate fears to read [a book/ the book].'

(iii) *-ja* (from (ii)) ((↑OBJ)* OBJ DEF)_c + similar annotations for other person/number definiteness suffixes otherwise, default indefinite agreement applies

Technical issues

Alsina (2008): the theory of structure-sharing for equi

- Verbal categories must have a SUBJ → the infinitives in (1-3)
- For structure-sharing (raising), one of the GFs involved must be non-thematic.
- In (1)-(3), the main clause SUBJ is thematic → no structure-sharing → the infinitival's GF is provided with 'PRED pro'.
- For NP/DP complements in (1)-(3), no embedded SUBJ is needed → unified analysis

LMT

- Kibort (2007): fixed valency template, map to least marked GF.

-o/-r -r +o -o

- Having an open complement (-s) should be lexically specified.

(i) *akar* 'want' [-o], [-r] → <(SUBJ)(OBJ)>

(ii) *tűnik* 'seem' [-o], [+o, -s] → (SUBJ) <(XOBJ_o)>

(iii) *nyilvánít* 'declare' [-o], [+o, -s], [-r] → <(SUBJ)(XOBJ_o)> (OBJ)

What about functionally controlled equi?

Do we really need -s functions?

Are there -r open functions (XSUBJ, XOBJ)?

(6) *Kati kezd / kezdő szeretni egy könyvet / a...könyvet.*
Kate begins.INDEF begins.DEF like.INF a book.ACC the book.ACC