

## Hungarian Embedded Subjunctive Clauses: a Family Business

This paper examines the syntax of Hungarian subjunctive embedded clauses. Based on evidence that subjunctives are a category proper, but that all embedded subjunctives do not exhibit a uniform behavior w.r.t tense and to extraction, I propose that embedded subjunctive clauses come in different shapes, and form a continuum, in terms of a gradable ‘size’ of the embedded clause.

Literature on Hungarian subjunctives (see a.o Kiefer 2003, E.Kiss 2003, Tóth 2010, Turi 2009) states that (i) some predicates select embedded subjunctive clauses, which occur with a complementizer *hogy*; (ii) other predicates select embedded imperative clauses, which also occur with the complementizer *hogy* (which in this case is optional); (iii) imperative and subjunctive embedded clauses happen to share morphological marking, imperative being recognizable by the typical verb-particle inversion. In this respect, there is debate as to the respective status of subjunctive and imperative.

The present syntactic analysis seeks to answer the following questions: (i) Is it legitimate to talk about a category ‘subjunctive’/‘imperative’ in Hungarian, and does this affect the properties of the complementizer ‘hogy’? (ii) How is subjunctive encoded? How is checked? (iii) what is the structure of an embedded subjunctive clause?

In the course of the investigation, I examine several classes of predicates which embed subjunctive clauses: (i) directives, (ii) permissives, (iii) purposives, (iv) desideratives, (v) modals. With respect to the first question, the relevant distinction is directives (and some desideratives, which, I argue, have directive force) versus other classes. Although imperative proper does not exhibit its own morphology (as opposed to e.g. romance languages or most Germanic languages), with the notable exception of *gyere*, *gyeriink*, *gyertek*, I assume that embedded clauses are not truly imperative (as also proposed in Farkas 1992, Turi 2009); but I propose that they do not even have a real imperative operator. Arguments in favor of this claim are that true imperatives only have 2<sup>nd</sup> person sing, (1<sup>st</sup> plur) and 2<sup>nd</sup> plural, that is, they have a feature + addressee, -speaker (1<sup>st</sup> plural includes addressees), and – third party (see the *gyere* ‘suppletive’ forms). Subjunctives embedded under directive verbs have all (except 1<sup>st</sup> singular) persons. I will assume that they are not imperative (imperative is a form, which can convey different illocutionary forces, see Condoravdi and Lauer 2012). *Directive* is an illocutionary force, which is selected by ‘directive’ predicates. I adopt the view that selection is essentially local (or in Minimalist terms, that only local features can trigger Merge). In the case of subjunctives, which, I assume here, are embedded (dependent) phenomena, the relevant feature can only be located on the complementizer ‘hogy’. The feature composition of ‘hogy’ will then be responsible for determining further properties of the embedded clause. I assume that ‘hogy’ may combine (or *span*, following e.g. Starke 2010) more or less features. One of the properties of the matrix predicate is to match/check/select one such set of features. I propose that the relevant property/feature of the matrix predicate is specificity (author et al. 2012), along the lines of Den Dikken (2006).

Answers to the second question involve both the CP layer and lower functional projections. I propose that *hogy* selected by the classes of verbs above also includes a feature which is selected by the matrix predicate, and which corresponds to the property that the embedded proposition undergoes a shift in the model of evaluation (Quer 1998). This feature (which I tentatively label W(world), following Kempchinsky 2009) is part of the featural make-up of (‘subjunctive’) *hogy*. In addition, all of these embedded clauses are signaled by a specific morphology. It occurs on  $\nabla$  (very much like tense, etc). I assume that subjunctive morphology is

the expression of an uninterpretable feature, which is associated with the verbal head. Therefore, the structure must contain the relevant interpretable feature which will occur in a Mood projection (see e.g. Pollock 1993, Giorgi and Pianesi 2004, Roussou 2009).

In the structure, it will have to be relatively ordered w.r.t other projections, and its presence related to selectional properties. This is part of the answer to question (iii). It turns out that subjunctive clauses exhibit a non-uniform behavior in more than one respect.

(a) a well-known distinction between directives (and some desideratives) and other subjunctive clauses. In addition to strict obviation effects, directives trigger verb-particle inversion, suggesting that MoodP is located below the (left-peripheral) landing site of inversion.

(b) extraction facts. Whereas there are general assumptions about the extractability from subjunctive clauses (see e.g. Turi (2009), the picture is not so clear. We rather observe a gradual increase in acceptability, ranging from low in clauses embedded under directives, with variably degraded in permissives and purposives, to acceptable with desideratives and modals (the latter may be analysed as undergoing partial restructuring, as attested by the occurrence of the verbal particle in the matrix clause):

- (1)a. \*? Borsosan követelte, hogy elkészítsem a nyulat  
*With pepper he required that I cook the rabbit.*  
b. Borsosan akarod, hogy elkészítsem a nyulat  
*With pepper you want that I cook the rabbit.*  
c. El kell, hogy készítsem a nyulat.  
*I must prepare the rabbit.*

Turi proposes that extractability is related to the absence of a TP in subjunctive clauses. While I consider that subjunctive clauses come with a TP, the variability in tense ‘dependency’ shows that not all subjunctive clauses have the same T.

(c) temporal dependency. While directives, purposives and desideratives (to some extent) exhibit some temporal flexibility w.r.t the matrix clause, the latter is completely rigid in modals:

- (2)a. Tegnap követelte, hogy ma induljunk. *He required yesterday that we leave today.*  
b. ??Tegnap kellett, hogy ma induljunk. *It was necessary yesterday that we leave today.*

These observations lead to the conclusion that subjunctives correspond to different clauses, with different structures. I would like to propose that subjunctive embedded clauses come in different flavors, which are not mutually exclusive but gradably inclusive. Directives have a larger feature set, which will be reflected in a larger array of functional projections, permissives and purposives lack the directive feature, desideratives are even ‘smaller’, with a reduced TP, as attested by the extraction possibilities, while modals lack some specifications altogether, since they undergo partial restructuring.

Condoravdi, C. & Lauer 2012. “Imperatives: meaning and illocutionary force”. *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 9*, ed. Christopher Piñón, pp. 37–58 • Den Dikken, M. (2006). *When Hungarians Agree (to Disagree) - The Fine Art of ‘Phi’ and ‘Art’*. Ms, CUNY.É. • E-Kiss K., Kiefer F. & Siptár P. 2003. *Új magyar nyelvtan*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó. • Farkas, D. 1992. “Mood Choice in Complement Clauses”. In: Kenesei I. & Pléh Cs.: *Approaches To Hungarian 4*. Szeged: JATE, 207–224. • Giorgi, A., Pianesi, F., 2004. *Complementizer deletion in Italian*. In: Rizzi, L. (Ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP*. pp. 190–210. OUP. • Kempchinsky, P. 2009. “What can the subjunctive disjoint reference effect tell us about the subjunctive?”. *Lingua 119*:1788–1810 • Quer, J. 1998. *Mood at the interface*. Ph.D. dissertation, UiL OTS/Universiteit Utrecht • Roussou, A. 2009. “In the mood for control”. *Lingua 119*, 1811–1836. • Tóth, E. 2008. *Mood choice in Complement Clauses*. Peter Lang. • Turi G. 2009. “Kötőmód a mai magyar nyelvben”. *Argumentum*, 5 :25-38.