subordinators and challenging clause-type markers
Hungarian hogy (Koopman and Szabolsci (2000))

English: that (-WH, +fin, if (+wh, +Fin)

Hungarian: hogy introduces tensed interrogative and declaratives

Tudov, hogy el mentem
know-you, that away went-1sg
‘You know that I left’

Tudov, hogy ki ment el
know-you, that who went away
‘You know that I left’

Tudov, hogy el mentem-e Marihoz
know-you, that away went Q Mari
‘You know whether I visited Mari’
Hungarian hogy (continued…)

Hogy clause with subjunctive allows for VM climbing (Kiss (1994))

Hungarian differs in this respect from Romance languages (no clitic climbing out of che complements, OK if di/a intervenes; neutral focus)

Szét kell, hogy szedjem a radiót

Apart must that take-subj-1sg the radio-acc

‘I must take apart the radio’ Aludni kell, hogy menjek

Ignazak kellet, hogy tarstam sleep-inf must that go-subj-1sg

true-dat must-past, that hold-subj-1sg

‘I had to think it true’

A városba kell, hogy koeltoezzenek the city-into must that move-1sg

Szét szedni

ignazal tarstni (check inf.form)

a várobsba menni

aludni menni
Kayne: a de are merged higher than V
--hogy is merged high (in SubordinateP)
each piece of analysis is independently motivated (CPs move)
Hungarian left periphery..
Surprising Clause type markers

- Kru languages: (Koopman, 1984)
  - Vata, (Dida) Bete, …
Some challenges:
clause-type markers in unexpected positions
Infl in Vata and Bete (Koopman, 1984)

Hmm, this should really be reanalyzed

• S I X V Y order; postpositional
• No SAI;
• no postverbal subjects;
• VP domain quite free (but for small clauses/particles/V) (*now* on left edge, as temporal adverbs)
• wh-movement: leftwards; subject/object, adjunct asymmetries
• coordination: [I + VP] cannot be coordinated
• clause final particles, (Q), WH, initial subordinator (“say” complementizer)
What are the options for the language learner? What patterns are possible?

Clause final Q marker:

Rules of the game:

• Force attracts IntP/FinP universally; (FinP can pied-pipe some bigger category)
• There is only overt XP movement in the syntax;
• doubly filled C filter: a head and a specifier cannot both contain overt lexical material (for a suggestion of how to derive this from the LCA Koopman, 1997)

--- overt Force markers do not exist (at least not in root environments) Force is typically expressed by intonation
IntP: What surface orders are possible? How well does this fit the actual typology?

A. **Force Int Fin** (*if Force attracts Fin*)

b. **Int Fin** Force

c. **Fin** Force **Int** [*talk about Vata*]
A hard nut to crack: Vata questions/relative clauses

(1) \( \text{wh SU (Neg) .. V (adv) T (bO) DO Adv SC V la.} \)

What is the derived constituency? What is the hierarchy?

La > wh> bo;
wh> la>bo;
bo>wh>la
ForceP=wh-question?
• Ho can we make sense of the following general properties?

  • i. No SAI;
  • ii. no postverbal subjects;
  • iii. VP domain quite free (but for small clauses/particles/V) (*now*: on left edge, as temporal adverbs)
  • iv. wh-movement: leftwards; subject/object, adjunct asymmetries
  • v. coordination: [*I + VP*] cannot be coordinated
  • vi. clause final particles, initial subordinator (“say” complementizer)

There is SAI (TP to Fin) Constituency of TP is what differs (i.e. distribution of subject); also accounts for no postverbal subjects

There is SAI (TP to Fin) Constituency of TP is what differs (i.e. distribution of subject); also accounts for no postverbal subjects

Wh-asymmetries….  
Coordination:--> nice result. 
Predictions (seem borne out)