



UDC 811.511.141'367=111

Original scientific article

Received on 20.02. 2018

Accepted for publication on 23.09. 2018

Krisztina Szécsényi
ELTE Hungary

Postverbal-only focus as evidence for biclausal structure in Hungarian*

In Hungarian, focused constituents appear in a preverbal position. Postverbal focus is possible, but only in multiple focus constructions, in the presence of a preverbal focus. The present paper discusses constructions with only postverbal focus and argues that what seem to be monoclausal patterns are biclausal underlyingly, where the postverbal focus is actually in the preverbal position in a non-finite clause. The biclausal analysis is supported by the obligatory modal interpretation of such sentences. The embedded verb is claimed to undergo movement to the matrix clause to support a bound zero modal with the postverbal position reflecting the scope properties of the sentence. This analysis makes it possible to account for other constructions with covert modal meanings in a more principled manner as well.

Key words: covert modality; scope rigidity; Hungarian; postverbal focus.

1. Introduction

Szabolcsi (2005; 2007; 2009a,b) discusses a number of languages including Hungarian, where embedded infinitival clauses can have subjects in nominative case. As attested in sentence (1), a Hungarian infinitival complement clause can appear with what seems to be a nominative subject related to the infinitive itself.¹ A context is given to ease understanding.

* For useful remarks I am grateful to the audience of the SinFonIJA10 conference and especially my two anonymous reviewers, whose comments have substantially improved this paper. I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the NKFI FK 128518 research grant.

¹ The present paper focuses on Hungarian for expository purposes, but Hungarian is not the only language where infinitival clauses can have nominative subjects. Szabolcsi (2009b) discusses cross-

Context: a class visiting a museum, most of them can go by car, but one person has to take the bus.

- (1) *Péter_i nem akar-t [csak ő_i men-ni bus-szal].*
 Peter.NOM not want-PST only he/she.NOM go-INF bus-INS
 ‘Peter didn’t want to be the only one to take the bus.’

Szabolcsi argues that the nominative *only*-DP with an obligatory control interpretation is the subject of the infinitive. If this turns out to be right and the nominative subject is the subject of the infinitival clause obvious questions emerge concerning the origin of nominative case arguably available only in finite clauses. Szabolcsi accounts for the data assuming multiple agree and Long Distance Agreement resulting in the obligatory control interpretation for the embedded pronominal. One of the arguments is based on the claim that postverbal focus in Hungarian is contingent on the presence of a preverbal focus constituent, and, since in sentence (1) there is no preverbal focus present in the finite clause, the focused DP must belong to the preverbal domain of the infinitive. In the corresponding monoclausal sentence the *only*-DP cannot surface in a postverbal position (2). This is explained under the assumption that *only*-DPs have an obligatory focus feature that needs to be checked in the specifier position of a FocP, which in Hungarian directly precedes the verbal projection. The grammatical sentence is (2b), where the *only*-DP precedes the verb.

- (2) a. **Nem ment bus-szal csak ő/csak Péter.*
 not went bus-INS only he/she.NOM/only Peter.NOM
 b. *Csak ő/csak Péter nem ment bus-szal.*
 only he/she.NOM/only Peter.NOM not went bus-INS
 ‘It is only Peter who did not go by bus.’

Though in Szécsényi (2018) I diverge from Szabolcsi’s account regarding the role Agree plays in these constructions, I share Szabolcsi’s view concerning the status of the *only*-DP. However, there exists a set of data observed by Csaba Olsvay (p.c.) shown in (3) that can be presented as potential argument against the restriction concerning the presence of postverbal foci. This construction type is the topic of the present paper. In (3) there is a focus (or even two foci as the object can also be an *only*-DP) in the postverbal position without there being a preverbal focus in the sentence, and the result is grammatical. A context is given to ease the understanding of the scope relations.

linguistic variation, and Barbosa (2018) adds further data from European Portuguese. Both works emphasize that such constructions are attested only in pro-drop languages.



Context: A group of scouts are preparing lunch. They manage to make enough soup for everybody, but the main dish is less than needed. Somebody will have to make do with soup only.

- (3) *Nem esz-ek csak én (csak) leves-t.*
 not eat-1SG only I.NOM only soup-ACC

‘I am not **willing to/going to** be the only one who eats (only) soup.’

If it is possible to have a postverbal-only focus with no focused constituent in the preverbal domain in a monoclausal construction, there may be exceptions to the general rule, which sentence (1) can also be the manifestation of. This would substantially weaken the claim for the *only*-DP as part of the infinitival clause in (1) as well. However, the exceptional behaviour of these sentences can be argued to be based on scope. Hungarian is well-known for its potential to reflect the scope properties of the sentences: our *only*-DPs can appear in the preverbal focus position, but then the interpretation of the sentence changes radically (4–5).

- (4) *Csak Péter (nem) akar-t bus-szal men-ni.*
 only Peter.NOM not want-PST bus-INS go-INF

‘Only Peter did (not) want to take the bus.’

- (5) *Csak én (nem) esz-ek leves-t.*
 only I.NOM not eat-1SG soup-ACC

‘It is only me who is (not) eating soup.’

What I claim in the present paper is that the sentences in (1) and (3) have very similar underlying structures, where the *only*-DP uniformly appears in the left peripheral focus position of an embedded non-finite clause, that is, the sentence in (3) as opposed to (5) has a biclausal structure underlyingly. Potential evidence for this claim comes from the obligatory modal meaning associated with sentence (3), which, importantly, is completely absent from sentence (5). In the rest of the paper I present further evidence supporting my claim. Section 2 discusses the word order facts of the postverbal domain of Hungarian and shows that our seemingly monoclausal construction in (3) does not meet these expectations. In section 3 we introduce the main gist of the proposal and discuss biclausal parallels for (3), observing further differences in word order supporting our claim. Section 4 presents earlier approaches to overt and covert modality in Hungarian and introduces the details of the proposal according to which the matrix verb originates in a non-finite embedded clause with a left periphery, in a structure very similar to that of (1). However, as opposed to the verb in (1), the embedded verb of (3) moves on to a higher position due to the presence of a covert modal in the matrix clause and surfaces in a fi-



nite form. Our proposal actually completes the earlier proposals discussed resulting in a more explanatory account of those data as well. Section 5 discusses some emerging questions, such as the problem of improper movement, learnability, spelling out the pronoun, and restructuring from a cross-linguistic perspective.

2. Word order and scope in Hungarian

2.1. General background information

Word order in Hungarian is determined by scope and information structure considerations in the preverbal domain and free in the postverbal field. When present, topics precede quantified expressions with a distributive reading (Szabolcsi 1997), which in turn precede the focus of the sentence appearing directly in the position before the verb (É. Kiss 1987; 2002; Horváth 1986; Kenesei 1986; Szendrői 2006). This gives rise to the following template:

- (6) TopP > QP > FocP > vP > rest of the sentence

In a neutral sentence a verb with a preverb surfaces in the preverb–verb order (7a). In the presence of focus and negation (which can co-occur) the verb leaves the vP and undergoes movement to the head of FocP in the left periphery, leaving the preverb behind (7bc).

- (7) a. *Péter meg-ette a leves-t.*
Peter.NOM PV-ate the soup-ACC
'Peter has eaten the soup.'
- b. (*Csak*) *PÉTER ette meg a leves-t.*
only Peter.NOM ate PV the soup-ACC
'It is (only) Peter who has eaten the soup.'
- c. *Péter nem ette meg a leves-t.*
Peter.NOM not ate PV the soup-ACC
'Peter did not eat the soup.'

Topicalization and movement to QP do not trigger preverb-verb inversion (8). In these cases the verb does not undergo movement to the left periphery.

- (8) *Péter hétfő-n is meg-ette a leves-t.*
Peter.NOM Monday-SUPE also PV-ate the soup-ACC
'Peter ate the soup on Monday as well.'

Postverbal focus in a simple sentence in Hungarian is known to be contingent on the presence of a preverbal focused constituent. If there is only one focus in the



sentence it has to appear in the left peripheral Spec, FocP position. Certain expressions such as *only*-phrases obligatorily appear in a FocP (9).

- (9) a. *Csak én ette-m meg a leves-t.*
 Only I.NOM ate-1SG PV the soup-ACC
 ‘Only I ate the soup.’
- b. **Meg-ette-m a leves-t csak én.*
 PV-ate-1SG the soup-ACC only I.NOM

While there can only be at most one focused constituent in the position directly preceding the verb, multiple focus is possible in Hungarian. The general assumption regarding multiple foci is that all of them target Spec,FocP positions in the left periphery of the clause. However, with the verb moving to the highest Foc head position the resulting word order is one where there is only one focused constituent preceding the verb (10a). This accounts for the postverbal position of the rest of the foci and the fact that there cannot be more than one focused constituent in the position preceding the verb (10b).²

- (10)a. *Csak én ette-m meg csak egy sütemény-t.*
 only I.NOM ate-1SG PV only one cake-ACC
 ‘I am the only one who ate only one cake.’
- b. **Csak én csak egy sütemény-t ette-m meg.*
 only I.NOM only one cake-ACC ate-1SG PV

Hungarian is also known for its freedom of word order in the postverbal domain, which Kiss (2008) explains by assuming a phase-based flattening of structure affecting this domain. Even left peripheral constituents such as FocPs undergo flattening if they end up after the verb. É. Kiss also points out that the resulting order may actually be affected by extra-syntactic factors like phonological weight in terms of Behaghel’s Law of Growing Constituents (1932). This explains why a phonologically very light preverb typically precedes all the other postverbal constituents, as seen in (10a). Everything being equal, word order in the postverbal domain of Hungarian can indeed be considered free (11) (É. Kiss 2008: 444).

- (11)a. *CSAK EGYSZER veszett_i nagyon össze (t_i) Éva Péter-rel.*
 only once fell very.much PV Eva.NOM Peter-INS
 ‘It was only once that Eva fell out with Peter a lot.’
- b. *CSAK EGYSZER veszett nagyon Éva össze Péterrel.*

² For more information on multiple operator movements in Hungarian see Surányi (2002a).



- c. *CSAK EGYSZER veszett össze Péterrel Éva nagyon.*
 d. *CSAK EGYSZER veszett össze Éva nagyon Péterrel.*
 etc.

2.2. Factoring in scope

If there is only one focus in a simple positive statement, it can only surface in the position directly preceding the verb (9). In the presence of negation, also a scope-bearing element, different options are available depending on scope interpretation: the focus can be in the scope of negation, or vice versa. Returning to our ungrammatical sentence in (2) repeated here as (12a), let us also consider the two grammatical options in (12b–c), offering an explanation for why (12a) is ungrammatical.

- (12)a. * *Nem ment bus-szal csak ő/csak Péter.*
 not went bus-INS only he/she.NOM/only Peter.NOM
- b. *Csak ő/ csak Péter nem ment bus-szal.*
 only he/she.NOM/ only Peter.NOM not went bus-INS
 ‘Only he/she/Only Peter did not go by bus.’
 only > not
- c. *Nem csak ő/ csak Péter ment bus-szal.*
 not only he/she.NOM/ only Peter.NOM went bus-INS
 ‘It is not only him/her/It is not only Peter who went by bus.’
 not > only

Surányi (2002b) accounts for these facts assuming a multiple specifier where the constituents in question surface based on scope considerations: the constituent with wider scope precedes the one it takes scope over. Since nothing is gained by having the *only*-DP after the verb in this case, as the potential scope interpretations are exhausted by (12bc), that order is ruled out. Also, notice that the *only*-DP is the only focus in the sentence, so the presence of a second FocP cannot be assumed, and the focus has to appear in the focus position preceding the verb.

The situation changes when we deal with more complex sentences. In this case further scope interpretations become possible between a focused constituent and main clause negation: the selecting verb can also be a scope bearing element. Regarding *akar* ‘want’ taking an infinitival complement we have the options listed in (13). Notice an important difference between focusing in finite as opposed to infinitival clauses regarding preverb-verb inversion: in finite clauses it is obligatory, in infinitival clauses it is optional (Brody 1995).



- (13)a. only somebody not wanting to do something:
Csak Péter nem akar-t bus-szal men-ni/men-ni bus-szal.
 only Peter.NOM not want-PST bus-INS go-INF/ go-INF bus-INS
 ‘Only Peter not wanted to go by bus.’
 only > not > want
- b. not only somebody wanting to do something (others want it too):
Nem csak Péter akar-t bus-szal men-ni/men-ni bus-szal.
 not only Peter.NOM want-PST bus-INS go-INF/ go-INF bus-INS
 ‘It is not only Peter who wanted to go by bus.’
 not > only > want
- c. somebody not wanting to be the only one to do something.
Péter nem akar-t csak ő
 Peter.NOM not want-PST only he/she.NOM
men-ni busz-szal/ bus-szal men-ni.
 go-INF bus-INS / bus-INS go-INF
 ‘Peter didn’t want to be the only one to take the bus.’
 not > want > only

3. The proposal

This section introduces the main component of the proposal with empirical arguments supporting it. The detailed account is postponed until Section 4.3., following a discussion of auxiliaries and another covert modal construction in Hungarian.

3.1. *Biclausal structure with a covert matrix modal*

Notice that (13c) is exactly the sentence type Szabolcsi discusses, our sentence (1). Elsewhere (Szécsényi 2018) I argue that languages need to meet certain conditions in order to have this construction type, one of them being the availability of left peripheral projections associated with the embedded non-finite clause. For Hungarian this has been argued for independently (Komlósy 1992; Dalmi 2005; Szécsényi 2009a,b). The *only*-DP as the sole focus in this sentence can appear in a position expressing the given scope interpretation because non-finite clauses in Hungarian can host a FocP projection, and this way the DP with its obligatory focus feature can surface in a position where it is in the scope of both negation and modality. Similar claims can be made for the other languages with nominative subjects in infinitival clauses discussed in Szabolcsi (2009b).

Bearing this in mind let us turn to our monoclausal-looking sentence in (3), repeated here as (14a). In (14b) we can see not only that with the *only*-DP in initial position the scope relationships change, but also that the modal meaning is not present. (14c) is added merely for the sake of completeness, to draw attention to the fact that the variation in the potential interpretations of this sentence differs from what we saw in the ordinary simple sentence in (12), where only (12b) and (12c) were well-formed. The grammaticality and the modal interpretation of (14a) suggest that we are dealing with something more complex than what actually meets the eye.

- (14)a. *Nem esz-ek csak én csak leves-t.*
 not eat-1SG only I.NOM only soup-ACC
 ‘I am not **willing to/going to** be the only one who eats only soup.’
 negation > willing > only
- b. *Csak én nem esz-ek csak leves-t.*
 Only I.NOM not eat-1SG only soup-ACC
 ‘It is only me who does not eat only soup.’
 only > negation > only
- c. *Nem csak én esz-ek csak leves-t.*
 not only I.NOM eat-1SG only soup-ACC
 ‘It is not only me who eats only soup.’
 negation > only > only

Now we are in the position to make the main claim of the present paper: we take the similarities pointed out above as suggesting that the sentences in (1) and (3) have similar underlying structures, where sentence (3) also has a biclausal underlying structure with a covert modal in the main clause corresponding to the overt *akar* ‘want’ of sentence (1) (as opposed to (14b–c) above, which are ordinary simple sentences). This covert modal triggers the movement of the embedded verb into the matrix clause.

- (1) *Péter nem akar-t [csak ő*
 Peter.NOM not want-PST only he/she.NOM
men-ni busz-szal/bus-szal menni].
 go-INF bus-INS/bus-INS go-INF
 ‘Peter didn’t want to be the only one to take the bus.’
- (3) *Nem esz₁-Ø-ek [csak én t₁ csak leves-t].*
 not eat-1SG only I.NOM only soup-ACC
 ‘I am not **willing to/going to** be the only one who eats only soup.’



In the next section we present further evidence for this claim, one coming from restrictions on word order in the postverbal domain of the clause, and another to do with the ban on more than one focus in the position directly preceding the non-finite verb in an embedded clause.

3.2. Further arguments

3.2.1. Multiple postverbal foci

As we have seen, it is the preverbal domain of a Hungarian sentence that has discourse based word order with fixed positions, with the order of multiple operators defined based on their scope properties (e.g. 14). Multiple foci are possible in Hungarian, but then, due to the movement of the verb to the highest Focus head position, all the other foci but the first end up in a position following the verb. We also pointed out that the postverbal domain has free word order in a simple sentence with phonological weight potentially affecting the surface order. In light of this, what we see in (15) is rather unexpected: when there are two *only*-DPs after the verb in a sentence like (3), one of the orders is judged at least as severely degraded by native speakers. Without a context, judgements for (15a) are also difficult, but once a context is given, the sentence is accepted as a proper sentence of Hungarian with the interpretation necessary to express the given meaning. Native speakers also agree in there being a modal meaning associated with the sentence. The sentence in (15b), however, is judged either as ungrammatical or highly degraded.

- (15)a. *Nem esz-ek csak én csak leves-t.*
 not eat-1SG only I.NOM only soup-ACC
 ‘I am not **willing to/going to** be the only one who eats only soup.’
 neg>only

- b. **/??Nem esz-ek csak leves-t csak én.*
 not eat-1SG only soup-ACC only I.NOM

To account for this, I propose that there are two clausal domains in (15a). The verb *eszek* ‘eat’ is in the main clause of the sentence but it originates from an embedded one. There is no focus in the main clause, so the postverbal foci must belong to an embedded clause, similarly to the infinitival structures with overt *akar* ‘want’ in the matrix clause. Under the assumption that on its way to the main clause the verb ‘eat’ passes through the Foc heads of the embedded clause, the restrictions on word



order resembling Superiority effects are accounted for: as shown in (16), in a simple sentence, only the order attested in (15a) is possible.³

- (16)a. *Csak én esz-ek csak leves-t.*
 only I.NOM eat.1SG only soup-ACC
 ‘It’s only me who eats only soup.’
- b. **Csak leves-t esz-ek csak én.*
 only soup-ACC eat-1SG only I.NOM

In order to account for the ungrammaticality of (15b), all we need to do is refer to the restrictions on focusing in Hungarian pointed out so far: (i) the two *only*-DPs cannot be in the left periphery of the embedded clause in the given order, which is supported by the restriction indicated by (16b): on its way to the matrix clause the embedded verb moves to the respective focus heads in the left periphery of the embedded clause, passing through a stage like (16a). Since (16b) is ruled out, so is (15b); (ii) alternatively it could be argued that the first *only*-focus is the focus of the main clause, but that would bring us back to square one: postverbal foci do not appear without a preverbal one. Either way, the resulting structure is predicted to be ungrammatical.

At this point one might draw attention to the fact that sentences like (17) are actually grammatical in Hungarian. This is certainly true, but notice the interpretation associated with the sentence, where a modal meaning also appears.⁴ This suggests an account of this sentence parallel to what we are pursuing in the present paper for the sentences with nominative infinitival subjects. Though at first sight it does not seem to be necessary, since accusative case can straightforwardly be assigned within the infinitival clause in Hungarian, the fact that it is the first focus of the sen-

³ As pointed out by a reviewer, important questions arise concerning Superiority. Due to space limitations, I have to postpone this discussion to future work.

⁴ Sentence (17), as opposed to the episodic interpretation of the sentences with a nominative infinitival subject, also has a non-episodic, habitual interpretation similar to the English simple present tense. Interestingly, Hungarian has a designated auxiliary to express exactly this kind of meaning, *szokott* ‘usually does, habitually does’, past in form but present in meaning. Predictably, when the verb *szokott* appears in the sentence, the accusative *only*-DP appears in the left periphery of the infinitive, as shown in (i). Due to the different interpretation, the sentence with the habitual interpretation is grammatical in every person, every number, whereas the willingness cases work best in first person, which can be captured assuming pragmatic restrictions on expressing willingness.

(i) *Nem szokt-am csak leves-t en-ni.*
 not usually.do-1SG only soup-ACC eat-INF
 ‘I usually don’t eat only soup.’



tence in a postverbal position, should be alarming. So upon closer scrutiny a biclausal account is justifiable in this case as well, especially if it turns out to be independently necessary to explain the data with nominative subjects in non-finite clauses.

- (17) *Nem esz-ek csak leves-t.*
 not eat-1SG only soup-ACC
 ‘I am not willing to eat only soup.’

There is a prediction following from this: if no covert modal meaning can be associated with a sentence, postverbal focus (indicating a biclausal structure) is not possible. This prediction seems to be born out, as illustrated by the data in (18). The sentence in (18a) is ungrammatical.⁵

- (18)a. **Nem ett-em csak hétfő-n.*
 not ate-1SG only Monday-SUPE
 b. *Csak hétfő-n nem ett-em.*
 only Monday-SUPE not ate-1SG
 ‘It was only on Monday that I did not eat.’
 c. *Nem csak hétfő-n ett-em.*
 not only Monday-SUPE ate-1SG
 ‘It was not only on Monday that I ate.’

If the covert modality proposal for the nominative data turns out to be on the right track, (17) suggests a potential direction for extending the analysis to further data with postverbal-only focus in Hungarian. Now let us turn to the second construction type that supports our claim.

3.2.2. *Word order in parallel biclausal constructions*

When we compare the monoclausal pattern (19a) with parallel biclausal constructions (19bc), we find a restriction on word order in the biclausal case. In order to be grammatical (19c), the infinitival verb has to be between the two *only*-DPs. This is exactly what we observed in connection with multiple foci in section 2.1: multiple focus is possible in Hungarian, but, since the verb moves to the highest Foc head

⁵ An anonymous reviewer asks why this sentence cannot mean ‘I wasn’t willing to eat only on Monday’ (and not eat on the rest of the days of the week). Actually, it can. However, it requires such a special context that even the author of this article did not realize this possibility before explicitly being asked to think about it. The generalization still holds: if no covert modal meaning can be associated with a sentence, postverbal focus (indicating a biclausal structure) is not possible.

position, all the foci but the first one surface in a postverbal position. This again, especially with the restriction on the postverbal order in the monoclausal case discussed in the previous section, indicates that the two *only*-DPs are members of the left periphery of an embedded clause, where the verb has undergone further movement from the highest Foc head position of the embedded clause to the main clause.

- (19) a. *Nem esz-ek csak én csak leves-t.*
 not eat-1SG only I.NOM only soup-ACC
 ‘I am not **willing to/going to** be the only one who eats only soup.’
 neg>only
- b. **/??Nem akar-ok [csak én csak leves-t en-ni]*
 not want-1SG only I.NOM only soup-ACC eat-INF
 ‘I do not want to be the only one who eats soup.’
- c. *Nem akar-ok [csak én en-ni csak leves-t]*
 Not want-1SG only I.NOM eat-INF only soup-ACC

3.3. Interim conclusion

What we have argued for so far is that the nominative DPs are in the preverbal domain of an embedded non-finite clause in both (overtly and covertly biclausal) construction types. When two *only*-DPs are present in our sentences, they show Superiority effects irrespective of whether we have the seemingly monoclausal pattern or a sentence with an overt modal verb in the main clause. In the latter case, when the embedded verb can remain in the embedded clause, the restrictions on multiple focus are observed. Having seen both sides of the coin we can thus conclude that the two *only*-DPs in our sentences are members of an embedded clause. This also means that the general claim concerning focusing in Hungarian can be maintained: postverbal focus is not possible in Hungarian without a preverbal one. Of course all this is further supported by the modal interpretation associated with the monoclausal pattern. What is left for us to do now is giving the detailed derivation of the data.

4. Details of the covert modality proposal

My proposal builds to a large extent on two earlier proposals for Hungarian. One of them is Bartos’s (2002) account of (almost) root infinitives in Hungarian, the other Kenesei’s (2001) discussion of whether there are auxiliaries in Hungarian at all,



which in the case of Hungarian is an absolutely legitimate question to ask, as we will see.

4.1. *A previous account of covert modality in Hungarian: Bartos (2002)*

Bartos (2002) discusses Hungarian data that could potentially be regarded as root infinitival clauses. The two constructions the paper focuses on are root infinitives with a strong imperative meaning (command infinitives) and what Bartos, following Kiefer (1981), calls circumstantial modality infinitives. Since the circumstantial modality data are more related to the topic of the present paper I am going to focus on those in this section. A representative example is given in (20). The parallels between our data and (20) are obvious: the interpretation of the sentences involves a covert modal meaning, in this case possibility expressed in the form of *can* in the English translation. There is an important difference between the two construction types as well: Bartos's sentences are infinitival, whereas the sentences targeted in the present paper contain a finite verb.

- (20) *A hátsó sor-ok-ban is jól hall-ani, ami-t mond-asz.*
 the back row-PL-INE too well hear-INF what-ACC say-2SG
 'It can be heard well even in the back rows what you are saying.'
 (Bartos 2002: 25 (22a))

Though Bartos discards an account in terms of a biclausal structure, it is on grounds different from the present proposal for the covert modal construction. What the paper argues against is an analysis whereby "the apparently independent infinitival clause is in fact embedded under another clause expressing circumstantial modality, but where this superordinate clause undergoes ellipsis, leaving just the infinitival clause pronounced" (Bartos 2002: 27), the pattern shown in (21) (Bartos's (26a-a')).

- (21)a. *Nem lehet [hall-ani ami-t mond-asz].*
 not is.possible hear-INF what-ACC say-2SG
 'It is impossible to hear what you are saying.'
 a'. *Nem ~~lehet~~ [hallani amit mondasz].*

There are three arguments presented against such an account out of which we discuss two here:

(i) clauses embedded under *lehet* 'possible' display no inversion, but the infinitive can be inverted – actually it has to be inverted in (22b), ex. (27) in the original



paper:

- (22)a. *Alig lehet meg-érez-ni / *érez-ni meg ez-t.*
 hardly is.possible PV-feel-INF / feel-INF PV this-ACC
 → **Alig lehet megérezni ezt.*
 ‘This can hardly be sensed.’
- b. *Alig érezni meg / *megérezni ezt.*

(ii) the position of the question particle *-e*, which is after *lehet* in the biclausal sentence, but after the infinitive in the root infinitival construction instead of appearing after the preverb after ellipsis takes place (23), ex. (28) in the original paper:

- (23)a. *Meg lehet-e ismer-ni ő-t?*
 PV is.possible-Q recognize-INF he-ACC
 → **Meg lehet -e ismerni ő-t?*
 ‘Can he be recognized?’
- b. *Megismerni-e / *Meg-e ismerni ő-t?*
- c. **Meg lehet ismerni-e ő-t?*

At the same time Bartos (2002) observes that “PV-V inversion obtains whenever it does in finite clauses, e.g. in the scope of a negative element (...), or after a focused constituent” (Bartos 2002: 27). All in all, what we find is that the infinitival verb behaves as if it were finite in these constructions. This is strongly supported by a very important piece of data presented by Bartos, based on which he concludes that circumstantial modal infinitives are “quasi-finite clauses.” What we can see in (24) is that this type of infinitive can be introduced by *hogy* ‘that’, which, similarly to its English counterpart, can only introduce finite clauses.

- (24)a. *Maci Laci az-t kérdez-te, [hogy halla-ni-e ami-t mond]*
 Yogi Bear.NOM it-ACC asked-PST that hear-INF-Q what-ACC say
 ‘Yogi Bear asked if it is possible to hear what he said.’

(Bartos 2002: 30 (30b))

Ultimately Bartos settles for an account of these clauses as genuine root clauses with “a very degenerate, minimal matrix clause, consisting of just one element, a Mod-projection,” as shown in (25) arguing that, though this Mod_{circ} has no phonetic interpretation, its effects are detectable. Importantly, Bartos also notes that in Hungarian modality entails finiteness.

- (25) Mod_{circ} [CP ... [VP V_{inf}]]



All the data presented by Bartos are compatible with the claim made here for covert modality, so I propose that both constructions, postverbal-only foci with covert modality and circumstantial modal infinitives be accounted for the same way: assuming movement of the embedded verb to the finite clause. Examples (22b) and (23b) are accounted for in a straightforward manner: the verbs actually sit in the position of the finite verb, which also undergoes inversion after *alig* ‘hardly’ (26).

- (26) a. *Meg-ért-ett-em, ami-t mond-ott.*
 PV-understand-PST-1SG what-ACC say-PST
 ‘I understood what she/he said.’
- b. *Alig ért-ett-em meg, ami-t mond-ott.*
 hardly understand-PST-1SG PV what-ACC say-PST
 ‘I hardly understood what she/he said.’

What is left for us to account for is the difference in the apparent finiteness of the verb in the two construction types. While Bartos’s sentences seem to be genuine instances of root infinitives, the postverbal data would almost pass for an ordinary finite clause. Why can circumstantial modals retain the infinitival form? How does the non-finite verb of the postverbal focus construction end up having finite morphology? This also necessitates a closer look at the status of the Hungarian infinitival marker *-ni*, which Bartos assumes to be a part of the bare V-form and not the spellout of tense and finiteness. Kenesei’s (2001) account of Hungarian auxiliaries discussed in the next section offers some important insights regarding these questions.

4.2. *Auxiliaries in Hungarian: Kenesei (2001)*

The aim of Kenesei (2001) is to identify whether Hungarian has auxiliaries at all, and if so, what criteria can be used to identify them, with an emphasis on making cross-linguistic comparison feasible as well. Earlier work on auxiliaries in Hungarian identifies between zero and 19 verbs of Hungarian as belonging to this class, obviously using different (or no) formal or distributional criteria (for more details see the work cited). Based on Heine (1993), Kenesei claims that the main criterion for auxiliarihood is the non-existence of a thematic grid. With a systematic application of the agentivity tests and a very thorough investigation of subjectless environments he identifies three Hungarian verbs as the functional verbs (= core auxiliaries) of the Hungarian language that have no subject of their own: *fog* ‘will’, *szo-kott* ‘usually.does’, and *talál* ‘happen (to do sg accidentally)’. Other criteria in this graded classification of auxiliaries include the absence of non-finite forms, taking a

non-finite verb form as a complement, expressing a small range of notional domains (such as tense, aspect, modality, voice) and being non-nominalizable.

Turning to structural issues Kenesei establishes a hierarchy of functional projections based on which functional heads can and cannot occur together. The behaviour of three auxiliaries is not uniform: while *fog* and *szokott* can only combine with tense and agreement, *talál* can also have subjunctive and conditional forms, so they appear in different positions within the hierarchy as shown in (27), where the constituents in question can combine with the categories to their left.

(27) AgrSu > Tense > AgrOb > *fog/szokott* > Mood > *talál* > Pot > VP [+fin]

However, Kenesei does not go on to claim that these auxiliaries form separate classes among functional categories due to economy considerations, but decides to treat them as special verbs in a VP, with no theta-grid, and with their idiosyncratic selectional properties encoded in the lexicon. Kenesei claims that the three auxiliaries take a [-Tense] infinitival complement where the infinitival marker *-ni* is the head of this [-Tense] TP as shown in (28), (his (43)), where *fog* is the future auxiliary and *olvas* is the lexical verb ‘read’.

- (28) a. [_{AgrS} ... [_{Tense} [+finite] [[_{AgrS} ... [_{VP} [_V *fog*] [_{TenseP} [_{Tense} *-ni*] [_{VP} *olvas* ...]]]]]]]]]
 b. [_{AgrS} ... [_{Tense} *fog*_i + [+finite] [[_{AgrO} ... [_{VP} [_V *e*_i] [_{TenseP} [_{Tense} *olvas*_j-*ni*] [_{VP} *e*_j ...]]]]]]]]]

4.3. Putting the pieces of the puzzle together

Let us return to the main focus of the present paper, the two sentence types introduced at the beginning of the paper, repeated here as (29).

- (29) a. *Péter nem akar-t*
 Peter.NOM not want-PST
 [*csak ő men-ni bus-szal/bus-szal men-ni*]
 only he/she.NOM go-INF bus-INS/ bus-INS go-INF
 ‘Peter didn’t want to be the only one to take the bus.’
 b. *Nem esz-ek [csak én (csak) leves-t]*
 not eat-1SG only I.NOM only soup-ACC
 ‘I am not **willing to/going to** be the only one who eats (only) soup.’

As we have seen, the data discussed in Section 2 and 3 indicate that the nominative *only*-DPs are in the left peripheral focus position of an embedded clause, and in-



deed, postverbal focus is not possible in Hungarian without a preverbal one. I proposed that in (29b), which seems to be a monoclausal structure, the lower verb moves to the higher clause to support a bound modal verb.

In accounting for the data I rely on Kenesei's (2001) account of auxiliaries in Hungarian with two modifications.

First, I identify the auxiliaries in question as genuine members of the functional domain in today's Hungarian, though it cannot be debated that they are grammaticalized forms of lexical verbs. My reasons are the following: lexical categories are more or less uniform with respect to the positions that they occupy in syntactic structure, but functional categories have been shown to be subject to variation as discussed extensively especially by cartographic approaches such as Cinque (1999, 2006), among many others. I already find this contrast between lexical categories and functional ones highly explanatory in and of itself. More specifically, the behaviour of our covert modal resembles the two auxiliaries that can only merge with tense and agreement, so it is a perfect match for *fog* 'will' and *szokott* 'usually.does' in Kenesei's hierarchy, though in the light of a more refined cartographic approach, all of them are likely to target different positions in the hierarchy of functional domains, the exact details of which need not concern us here.

Second, I identify the complement of these auxiliaries as CPs, whereas Kenesei claims that they are [-Tense] TPs. It is based on empirical evidence showing that even auxiliaries can take a larger clausal complement, and not just a minimal [-Tense] TP followed by what Kenesei identifies as a VP, at least in the constructions under discussion here. Similarly to *akar* 'want', *fog* 'will' can also take an infinitival clause with a FocP (30).

- (30) *Péter nem fog/akar csak ő*
 Peter.NOM not will/want only she/he.NOM
men-ni bus-szal/busz-szal men-ni.
 go-INF bus-INS/bus-INS go-INF
 'Peter won't be/does not want to be the only one to go by bus.'

What I propose is that Kenesei's hierarchy of auxiliaries be adopted and extended with a bound zero volitional head grouped together with *fog* 'will' and *szokott* 'habitually does' for reasons to with distribution: they can show tense and agreement but have no subjunctive and conditional forms (31). This is what triggers the movement of the embedded verb sitting already in a high position, in the Foc head of the non-finite clause. In the presence of negation the verb undergoes another movement step to the head position of NegP as shown in (32b), summarizing the

essence of the proposal made in this paper.

(31) AgrSu > Tense > AgrOb > **zero circumstantial modality** > *fog*
 ‘will’/szokott ‘habitually does’ /**zero volitional modality**> Mood > *talál*
 ‘happen to’> Pot > CP_{inf}

(32)a. *Nem esz-ek [csak én (csak) leves-t]*
 not eat-1SG only I.NOM only soup-ACC
 ‘I am not **willing to/going to** be the only one who eats (only) soup.’

b. [CP [NegP not eat_i -1SG [Mod_{vol}P t_i [CP [FocP only I_j] t_i [FocP only soup_k] ...
 [VP t_j t_i t_k]]]]]]

If this account of postverbal-only focus constructions is on the right track it also offers a straightforward way of explaining why Bartos’s circumstantial modal clauses contain an infinitive that behaves as if it was finite: adding one further step to Bartos’s analysis it can be assumed that the circumstantial modality projection is also a bound zero head, a position where the infinitive undergoes movement. From this position it can move on i) to a Foc head position in the presence of focus to account for the obligatory preverb-verb inversion, or ii) to support the question particle *-e*, just like a finite verb does. In both of the cases we are dealing with a construction where the modal is not phonetically realized, but its presence is detectable in the interpretation of the sentence. In light of Cinque (2006), the position of the circumstantial modality projection is expected to be higher than volitional modality. I leave the verification of this for further research together with the relative hierarchy of *fog* ‘will’/szokott ‘habitually does’ and the zero volitional modality in (31).

Turning to the difference between the form marked with and without the *-ni* morpheme (the former in Bartos’s circumstantial modality clauses, the latter in the postverbal-only focus constructions), I am making the following tentative assumptions: the *-ni* suffix is not generated within the VP, but is added later during the derivation when the selected complement is big enough to be able to host it. The locus of this may be Kenesei’s [-Tense] TP, or FinP. While the three auxiliaries identified by Kenesei, and also the circumstantial modality construction of Bartos, select for this bigger infinitival complement, the bound volitional morpheme does not, there is no such projection present in the embedded clause.⁶ The non-finite verb can continue its way to the matrix zero and then pick up tense and agreement. At the same time, distinguishing the bound volitional zero from the bound circum-

⁶ Importantly, focusing is expected to be possible even in this case. Bartos (2002) also makes such an assumption, left peripheral constituents are shown to appear in what Bartos identifies as VP-sized constituents without a TP/IP/FinP. The status of the infinitive marker is not discussed in that work.



stantial modality zero suffix should also be straightforward. I propose that while the volitional zero selects a smaller complement, the circumstantial modality zero takes a complement actually containing *-ni*. As soon as this infinitival *-ni* appears, combining it with the [+fin] tense is impossible, but nothing prevents the verb from other behaviour characteristic of finite clauses such as undergoing movement to the Foc head resulting in preverb-verb inversion or supporting the question particle.

To summarize: I propose to complete Bartos's account of circumstantial modality infinitives with an extra step of movement to a bound zero modality head in the matrix clause resulting in a parallel treatment of postverbal-only focus constructions and Bartos's data. The only difference between the two constructions is in the size of the verbal expression undergoing movement: in circumstantial modality sentences we have a larger embedded clause containing the infinitive marker. In postverbal-only focus cases the embedded clause is a smaller non-finite structure without the infinitive marker that can carry the tense and agreement marking in the finite clause. Bartos's proposal in (25) is repeated here as (33) followed by the modification suggested here for a sentence like 'It is not possible to hear the music' (34). See (32b) for a comparison of the two constructions. In both representations the focus is on the movement of the verb.

(33) Mod_{circ} [CP ... [VP V_{inf}]]

(34) [CP [NegP not [hear_i+INF]_j] -1SG [Mod_{circ}P t_j [CP ... [TP/FinP [t_i+INF]_j] [vP ... t_i the music]]]]]]

5. Emerging questions

5.1. *Spelling out the controlled pronoun*

Concerning the question of when to spell out the pronoun of control constructions, which both of the sentences in (29) turn out to be, following Livitz (2013) I argue that when there are additional features such as focus associated with a constituent, it ceases to be a minimal pronoun and has to be spelled out overtly if the language in question has the tools to do so. Infinitival clauses in Hungarian have been identified as CPs, so spelling out a focused constituent in the left periphery of the infinitival clause is straightforward under such assumptions.

The actual implementation varies considering which of the several approaches to control we decide to adopt. Landau (2015) describes obligatory control as predicative control, where PRO is understood to be a minimal pronoun in the infinitival clause in control constructions with the role of a lambda-abstractor creating a

property.

Hornstein (1999), and some works following this including Boeckx et al. (2010) account for control in terms of movement, where a DP is assigned two theta-roles. Instead of the usual PRO, a trace is assumed to be present in the subject position of the non-finite clause, similarly to raising, with the difference that in the raising case the relevant DP is assigned only one theta-role. While it is usually the higher copy of the moved constituent that is spelled out, under certain conditions the lower copy may be the pronounced copy resulting in what Polinsky & Potsdam (2002) describe as a backward control construction. Scope and information structure considerations are potential candidates for such conditions. Under this approach the nominative *only*-DP could be regarded as the lower copy pronounced due to scope considerations. The problematic aspect of this approach is multiple theta-role assignment without identifying the deeper reasons behind it, that is, the semantics making it possible is fully missing. Landau's move from simply assuming a PRO in the subject position of non-finite clauses towards an attempt at defining the role predication plays in these constructions seems to be an important step in the right direction. On the other hand, the movement based approach can account for how the controller can be spelled out in a lower position much more straightforwardly.

In this paper I propose an in-between solution: the infinitive contains a minimal pronoun, which can fulfil its function of lambda-abstractor as proposed by Landau (2015). However, it is followed by a second round of predication in the FocP of the embedded non-finite clause,⁷ and, as a result, the pronoun is not minimal any longer, it needs to be spelled out (for a proposal along these lines see also Livitz (2013)). Also, focusing a constituent requires visible material, one more reason for the constituent in the Spec, FocP to be pronounced. For further details see the next section on improper movement and also Szécsényi (2018).

5.2. *The problem of improper movement*

A potentially fatal problem presents itself related to the movement approach to control: the nominative *only*-DP undergoes movement from an A-position to an A'-position in the specifier of the infinitival FocP, and then goes on to an A-position in the matrix clause. This can be identified as improper movement, assumed not to be possible in human language. Based on this we might as well exclude the control as movement approach as an option, but there are considerations that suggest that we should not do that. Once Long Distance Agreement (LDA) emerges as an option,

⁷ For focusing as predication see a.o. É. Kiss (2006)



certain aspects of grammar need to be rethought. One of them is what exactly it means to be a raising/control verb in a language that does not need to move the subject into its Spec, TP to check the EPP? As soon as Long Distance Agreement is available, the respective features can be checked via this mechanism and there is no real need for assuming the presence of even a *pro* in the matrix clause. Assuming *pro* is clearly a possibility, but not an absolute necessity, so there is a possibility for parametric variation here.⁸ If the EPP feature in the finite TP can be checked long distance, it can be argued that in those cases when the DP subject surfaces in the main clause we are dealing with A'-movement. To explain the fact that subjects typically end up in the finite clause we can identify this A'-movement as Topicalization: topics tend to appear in the highest clause and not in the embedded clause, unless there is a strong reason to do so. Also, one and the same constituent can be the topic of the matrix clause and the focus of the embedded infinitive, like in our case. Under this assumption the third movement is also A'-movement and we are not dealing with an instance of improper movement after all. It also brings us closer to capturing the connection between the availability of nominative infinitival subjects and the pro-drop property. As pointed out in the introduction, only pro-drop languages can have the pattern discussed in this paper. This means that, although Landau (2015) captures the semantics behind control much better, a movement approach to control still cannot be discarded.

Potential support for this claim comes from Kenesei (2001), where it is argued that the auxiliaries identified for Hungarian are different from raising constructions. Auxiliaries, as opposed to raising verbs, do not demand a structural subject and this way allow for subjectless complements as well. This leads to the contrast in (35), where the ungrammaticality of the construction with the raising verb follows once it is pointed out that the inessive DP cannot function as the subject of the raising verb *látszik* 'seem'. Inessive DPs, however, are perfect topics, so the grammaticality of (35a) is predicted.

- (35)a. *A szobá-ban nem szokott ki-takarít-va len-ni.*
 the room-INE not used PV-clean-PART_{va} be-INF
 approx. 'In the room (it) isn't usually cleaned.'
- b. **A szobá-ban ki-takarít-va látszik len-ni.*
 the room-INE PV-clean-PART_{va} seem be-INF
 approx. 'In the room (it) seems to have been cleaned'

⁸ Related to this is the different judgement of nominative infinitives with lexical *only*-DPs discussed in Szécsényi (2018), which are acceptable for only a subset of the Hungarian speakers and unattested in the majority of the languages allowing nominative infinitival subjects.

If this turns out to be right, and other verbs can long distance agree with their subject (with the exception of raising verbs), we have further evidence for the claim regarding the third movement step as topicalization and not A-movement. We also correctly predict that we cannot have postverbal-only focus with raising verbs, as that would indeed lead to the violation of the constraint on improper movement.

5.3. *Restructuring*

The analysis proposed above raises important questions for restructuring as well. Hungarian embedded infinitival complements have been identified as CPs but also as undergoing restructuring, which contradicts the received view concerning what units can be affected by clause union processes. While earlier works of Wurmbrand (2001; 2004 among others) argue for restructuring being possible only if the restructured unit is smaller than a CP, evidence from Korean seems to suggest that even CPs can undergo the process (Wurmbrand 2014). Hungarian then can be taken as providing further evidence for such a claim.

A further problem is related to size restructuring in Hungarian. In several works Wurmbrand (2004; 2014; 2015) claims that size restructuring is an “all-or-nothing property”: out of the three clausal domains (the thematic, inflection and operator domains), truncation targets whole domains from the top, resulting in two types of restructured complements: one containing only the thematic domain, or one with the inflectional domain present as well. Arbitrary truncation from the middle is not allowed. The Hungarian data however, or at least the accounts proposed for them are not compatible with such a view. We seem to have identified patterns with an operator domain but lacking at least certain members of the inflection domain: Bartos’s (2002) circumstantial modality infinitives or the postverbal-only focus constructions being representative examples. It is still hard to see how Hungarian fits into this account of restructuring.

Alternatively, as pointed out by a reviewer, adopting the analysis of modal existential constructions (MECs) in Šimik (2011) may be a way out of the size-related problem of restructuring. Šimik argues for a low position for moved *wh*-words in MECs, potentially as low as the VP. This makes it possible to maintain the claim that restructuring affects structures smaller than a CP. To see a representative example for Hungarian let us consider (36).



- (36) *Ez-en a csatorná-n nincs mi-t*
 This-SUPE the channel-SUPE not.exist what-ACC
*meg-néz-ni/*nézni meg.*
 PV-watch-INF/watch-INF PV
 ‘There is nothing to watch (=that one can watch) on this channel.’

MECs contain a selecting verb subject to cross-linguistic variation, but the verbs *be* and *have* are robustly attested. The embedded clause is introduced by a moved wh-word, which Šimik convincingly argues to be adjoined at different points in the embedded clause, which can be as small as a VP. The ban on preverb-verb inversion in Hungarian supports the account proposed in Šimik, but a similar ban in the case of focus cannot be observed. The optionality of inversion in the case of focusing indicates that the idea should be investigated further, but again, it is not straightforwardly applicable since structures with and without inversion do not show the expected restructuring-related differences in transparency phenomena. However, one remark that Šimik makes concerning the Hungarian data is worth pursuing in the light of the present proposal. He notes that cross-linguistically the verbs selecting MECs are existential predicates, with occasional idiosyncratic behaviour. This idiosyncrasy in the case of Hungarian turns out to be that the verbs *tud* ‘know’ and *bír* ‘be able to’, can both select MECs though they do not belong to the class of existential predicates. What we need to realize is that both of these verbs can express the modal meaning of possibility associated with MECs. Then, if my proposal is on the right track, the unique behaviour of Hungarian can be accounted for assuming that the embedded verb undergoes movement to the matrix clause, similarly to the two patterns discussed in this paper. Of course the details of such an analysis remain to be worked out, but there is some hope for not having to consider it accidental, but something falling out of a more general, but still relatively unique property of Hungarian: the ability of embedded verbs to undergo movement to the matrix clause. If operators can be treated along the lines proposed in Šimik, the Hungarian restructuring data can also be reconciled with the cross-linguistic claims made by a.o. Wurmbrand (2001; 2014; 2015) at long last.

A final remark: in the Szabolcsi sentences it actually seems to be the infinitival verb that has a left periphery with scope-driven order in the preverbal domain and free order postverbally. This also necessitates a discussion of how a biclausal structure can end up having monoclausal properties and where exactly É. Kiss’s (2008) flattening takes place in these constructions. Addressing this monoclausal-biclausal dichotomy, Szécsényi T. (2011; 2013) proposes an argument-inheritance based account for the Hungarian data in an HPSG framework, following Bouma’s (2003)

proposal for Dutch. According to this, the finite verb inherits the arguments of the infinitive, resulting in a single clausal domain, where a scope based reordering of the linear order of the constituents can take place. Incorporating these insights into our analysis is not straightforward, but for reasons of space now I leave these questions for future discussion.

5.4. *The question of acquisition*

When zero elements are proposed, questions related to learnability automatically present themselves. The environment where the zero element appears always has a central role in such proposals: it has to be salient enough to make the identification of a covert element possible. In order to account for the acquisition of these rather peripheral constructions, I assume that the cue is the presence of the postverbal *only*-DP without there being a preverbal focus. Since it is the only construction-type where we find this, it indicates that there is something more in the construction than what first meets the eye, and, accordingly, we find a modal interpretation associated with exactly these sentences. This may be further supported by the main driving force of Hungarian word order, namely scope. The requirement according to which *only*-DPs must appear in the specifier position of the matrix FocP can be overridden by scope-driven word order if independent properties of the language make it possible. In the case of Hungarian it can be done easily, since there is an embedded clause with its own FocP projection where the focus feature can be checked. Bartos's (2002) circumstantial modality sentences are also exceptional enough: true root infinitival clauses are rarely attested in the languages of the world, but when they are, they turn out to have very similar properties: as suggested by a reviewer, Czech has constructions very similar to Bartos's modals, where perception verbs appear in an infinitival form with a covert circumstantial modal interpretation discussed in Caha and Karlik (2005). The two Hungarian constructions are also substantially different from each other to distinguish the two different zero modals in the very different environments where they surface.

5. Conclusion

This paper claims that certain Hungarian constructions involve covert modality. These constructions deviate from the patterns established for Hungarian clause structure, but under this assumption they are exceptional only on the surface. One of the constructions is the seemingly monoclausal postverbal-only focus pattern with a volitional interpretation. Assuming a covert modal and an embedded clause



where the main predicate originates from accounts for the modal interpretation and results in a structure compatible with general assumptions on Hungarian clause structure. The proposal can be extended to Bartos's (2002) circumstantial modality infinitives as well. The exceptional nature of the sentences seems to provide enough clue for learners, but further research needs to clarify some questions related to control and restructuring.

References

- Barbosa, Pilar. 2018. Controlled overt pronouns as specificational predicates. In Santos, Ana Lúcia & Gonçalves, Anabela (eds.), *Complement clauses in Portuguese: Issues in Hispanic and Lusophone linguistics*, 129–186. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bartos, Huba. 2002. Root infinitives. In Kenesei, István & Siptár Péter (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian*, vol. 8, 13–38. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Behaghel, Otto. 1932. *Deutsche Syntax IV*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters.
- Boeckx, Cedric & Hornstein, Norbert & Nunes, Jairo. 2010. *Control as movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bouma, Gosse. 2003. Verb clusters and the scope of adjuncts in Dutch. In Seuren, Pieter A. M. & Kempen, Gerard (eds.), *Verb constructions in German and Dutch*, 5–42. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brody, Michael. 1995. Focus and checking theory. In Kenesei, István (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian*, vol. 5, 29–43. Szeged: JATE.
- Caha, Pavel & Karlík, Petr. 2005. Where does modality come from? In Hansen, Björn & Karlík, Petr (eds.), *Modality in Slavonic languages. New perspectives*, 61–72. München: Sagner.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2006. *Restructuring and functional heads. The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalmi, Gréte. 2005. *The role of agreement in non-finite predication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 1987. *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2002. *The syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2006. Focussing as predication. In Molnar, Valeria & Winkler, Susanne (eds.), *The Architecture of Focus*, 169–193. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2008. Free word order, (non-)configurationality and phases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39(3). 441–474.
- Heine, Bernd. 1993. *Auxiliaries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(1). 69–96.
- Horvath, Júlia. 1986. *Focus in the theory of grammar and the structure of Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kenesei, István. 1986. On the logic of word order in Hungarian. In Werner, Abraham & de Mey, Sjaak (eds.), *Topic, focus and configurationality*, 143–159. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kenesei, István (ed.). 2001. *Argument structure in Hungarian*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kenesei, István. 2001. Criteria for auxiliaries in Hungarian. In Kenesei, István (ed.), *Argument structure in Hungarian*, 73–106. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kenesei, István & Siptár, Péter (eds.). *Approaches to Hungarian*, vol. 8, *Papers from the Budapest Conference*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kiefer, Ferenc. 1981. What is possible in Hungarian? *Acta Linguistica A SH* 31. 147–185.
- Komlósy, András. 1992. Régenek és vonzatok. In Kiefer, Ferenc (ed.), *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan: Mondattan* [Structural Hungarian grammar: Syntax], 299–528. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Landau, Idan. 2015. *A two-tiered theory of control* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 71). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Livitz, Inna. 2013. *Deriving silence through dependent reference: Focus on pronouns*. Doctoral dissertation, New York: New York University. Retrieved from: <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002008>. Accessed 31 January 2018.
- Polinsky, Maria & Potsdam, Eric. 2002. Backward control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33. 245–282.
- Šimík, Radek. 2011. *Modal existential wh-constructions*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Surányi, Balázs. 2002a. *Multiple operator movements in Hungarian*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Surányi, Balázs. 2002b. Negation and the negativity of n-words in Hungarian. In Kenesei, István & Siptár, Péter (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian*, vol. 8, *Papers from the Budapest Conference*, 107–132. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 1997. Strategies for scope taking. In Szabolcsi, Anna (ed.), *Ways of scope taking*, 109–154. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2005. Overt infinitival subjects (if that's what they are). In Broekhuis, Hans & Corver, Norbert & Huybregts, Riny & Kleinhenz, Ursula & Koster, Jan (eds.), *Organizing grammar*, 618–625. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2007. *Hidden in plain sight: Overt subjects in infinitival control and raising complements*. Retrieved from: <http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000445>. Accessed: 2 August 2018.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2009a. Overt nominative subjects in infinitival complements in Hungarian. In Den Dikken, Marcel & Vago, Robert (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian*, vol. 11, 251–276. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2009b. Overt nominative subjects in infinitival complements cross-



- linguistically. NYU WPL in Syntax, Spring 2009, In Irwin, Patricia & Vasquez Rojas Maldonado, Violeta (eds.), Retrieved from: https://www.nyu.edu/projects/szabolcsi/szabolcsi_overt_nominative_nyuwpl.pdf Accessed: 2 August 2018.
- Szécsényi, Krisztina. 2009a. On the double nature of Hungarian infinitival constructions. *Lingua* 119(4). 592–624.
- Szécsényi Krisztina. 2009b. *An LF-driven theory of scrambling in Hungarian infinitival constructions*. Doctoral Dissertation. Szeged: University of Szeged.
- Szécsényi, Krisztina. 2018. Control and the left periphery: the scope and information structure properties of Hungarian infinitival complements with nominative, dative, and covert subjects. In Bartos, Huba & Den Dikken, Marcel & Bánréti, Zoltán & Várad, Tamás (eds.), *Boundaries crossed, at the interfaces of morphosyntax, phonology, pragmatics and semantics* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 94), 279–295. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Szécsényi Tibor. 2011. Magyar mondat szerkezeti jelenségek elemzése HPSG-ben. [Analyzing Hungarian sentence structure in HPSG]. In Bartos, Huba (ed.), *Új irányok és eredmények a mondattani kutatásban* [New directions and results in syntax], 99–138. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Szécsényi Tibor. 2013. Argument inheritance and left periphery in Hungarian infinitival constructions. In Müller, Stefan (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, 203–221. Stanford (California): CSLI Publications.
- Szendrői, Krisztina. 2006. Case # 43: Focus movement/ Hungarian. In Everaert, Martin & Van Riemsdijk, Henk (Eds.), *The syncom project*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2001. *Infinitives. Restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2004. Two types of restructuring – Lexical vs. functional. *Lingua*. 114(8). 991–1014.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2014. Restructuring across the world. In Veselovská, Ludmila & Janebová, Markéta (eds.), *Complex visibles out there. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2014: Language use and linguistic structure*, 275–294. Olomouc: Palacký University.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2015. Restructuring cross-linguistically. In Bui, Thuy & Özyıldız, Deniz (eds.), *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistics Society Annual Meeting 45*, 227–240. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.



Author's address:

ELTE Hungary
Department of English Linguistics
Rákóczi út 5, Budapest
E-mail: szecsényi.krisztina@btk.elte.hu

**POSTVERBALNI *SAMO*-FOKUS KAO DOKAZ SLOŽENE REČENIČNE STRUKTURE U
MAĐARSKOM**

Fokusni konstituenti u mađarskom jeziku javljaju se u predverbalnom položaju. Postverbalni fokus je moguć, ali isključivo u konstrukcijama s višestrukim fokusom, pri čemu je ujedno prisutan i predverbalni fokus. Rad razmatra isključivo konstrukcije s postverbalnim fokusom i dokazuje da je naizgled jednostavna rečenica u podlozi zapravo složena rečenična struktura s postverbalnim fokusom u predverbalnom položaju nefinitne klauze. Analiza rečenica na složenu rečenicu poduprta je obaveznom modalnom interpretacijom tih rečenica. Tvrdi se da se zavisni glagol pomaknuo u glavnu rečenicu kako bi podupro vezani nulti modal te da postverbalni položaj odražava svojstva dometa rečenice. Izložena analiza nudi načelno objašnjenje i za druge konstrukcije sa skrivenim modalnim značenjima.

Ključne riječi: skriveni modalitet; strogi domet; mađarski; postverbalni fokus.