

Premature Spell-Out in Colloquial Hungarian: Evidence for the Fine Structure of the Minimal VP

Lightning Talk
LCAD2020
October 15th, 2020
Bled

Tamás Halm
Research Institute for Linguistics (HAS)
Pázmány Péter Catholic University
halm.tamas@gmail.com
www.tamashalm.com

Introduction

Introduction

- What exactly is the minimal VP as such like?

Introduction

- What exactly is the minimal VP as such like?
- Difficult to know, since it is always evacuated (in part or even fully) in the course of the derivation.

Introduction

- What exactly is the minimal VP as such like?
- Difficult to know, since it is always evacuated (in part or even fully) in the course of the derivation.
- The minimal VP never emerges to the surface. ☹

Introduction

- What exactly is the minimal VP as such like?
- Difficult to know, since it is always evacuated (in part or even fully) in the course of the derivation.
- The minimal VP never emerges to the surface. ☹
- Never ever?

Introduction

- What exactly is the minimal VP as such like?
- Difficult to know, since it is always evacuated (in part or even fully) in the course of the derivation.
- The minimal VP never emerges to the surface. ☹
- Never ever?
- Well, it turns out that in Colloquial Hungarian, there does exist a clause type that is just the VP, pure and simple, without any additional functional material.

Introduction

- What exactly is the minimal VP as such like?
- Difficult to know, since it is always evacuated (in part or even fully) in the course of the derivation.
- The minimal VP never emerges to the surface. ☹
- Never ever?
- Well, it turns out that in Colloquial Hungarian, there does exist a clause type that is just the VP, pure and simple, without any additional functional material.
- Radically Truncated Clauses = minimal VPs

Introduction

- What exactly is the minimal VP as such like?
- Difficult to know, since it is always evacuated (in part or even fully) in the course of the derivation.
- The minimal VP never emerges to the surface. ☹️
- Never ever?
- Well, it turns out that in Colloquial Hungarian, there does exist a clause type that is just the VP, pure and simple, without any additional functional material.
- Radically Truncated Clauses = minimal VPs
- Unique opportunity to observe the VP by itself. 😊

Findings:

Findings:

- Hungarian VP is head-final (contrary to previous claims to the opposite)

Findings:

- Hungarian VP is head-final (contrary to previous claims to the opposite)
- OV is available as a basic, non-derived word order

Findings:

- Hungarian VP is head-final (contrary to previous claims to the opposite)
- OV is available as a basic, non-derived word order
- Corroboration for the split-DP proposal of Sportiche (2005)

Findings:

- Hungarian VP is head-final (contrary to previous claims to the opposite)
- OV is available as a basic, non-derived word order
- Corroboration for the split-DP proposal of Sportiche (2005)
- Support for the adjunction analysis of topicalization and QR

Findings:

- Hungarian VP is head-final (contrary to previous claims to the opposite)
- OV is available as a basic, non-derived word order
- Corroboration for the split-DP proposal of Sportiche (2005)
- Support for the adjunction analysis of topicalization and QR
- Backed up with corpus data (3.000+ RTC utterances) and an acceptability judgement survey (680 respondents)

Radically Truncated Clauses

Radically Truncated Clauses

- in informal spoken and written registers (blogs, forums)

Radically Truncated Clauses

- in informal spoken and written registers (blogs, forums)
- describe a succession of sub-events (or a single subevent) within a well-defined containing event or situation:

Radically Truncated Clauses

- in informal spoken and written registers (blogs, forums)
- describe a succession of sub-events (or a single subevent) within a well-defined containing event or situation.

(1) [*Namármost amikor én alud-t-am ott, úgy kezd-t-em, hogy*]
well when I sleep-PST-1SG there so start-PST-1SG that
'So when I was sleeping there, the way I started was
szemét le-visz, szoba rendbe-rak, fürdőszoba el-pakol...
rubbish PRT-carry room PRT-put bathroom PRT-pack
I took out the rubbish, I cleared the room, I cleared the bathroom.'

Radically Truncated Clauses

- in informal spoken and written registers (blogs, forums)
- describe a succession of sub-events (or a single subevent) within a well-defined containing event or situation.

(1) [*Namármost amikor én alud-t-am ott, úgy kezd-t-em, hogy*]
well when I sleep-PST-1SG there so start-PST-1SG that
'So when I was sleeping there, the way I started was
szemét le-visz, szoba rendbe-rak, fürdőszoba el-pakol...
rubbish PRT-carry room PRT-put bathroom PRT-pack
I took out the rubbish, I cleared the room, I cleared the bathroom.'

- RTCs:

Radically Truncated Clauses

- in informal spoken and written registers (blogs, forums)
- describe a succession of sub-events (or a single subevent) within a well-defined containing event or situation.

(1) [*Namármost amikor én alud-t-am ott, úgy kezd-t-em, hogy*]
well when I sleep-PST-1SG there so start-PST-1SG that
‘So when I was sleeping there, the way I started was
szemét le-visz, szoba rendbe-rak, fürdőszoba el-pakol...
rubbish PRT-carry room PRT-put bathroom PRT-pack
I took out the rubbish, I cleared the room, I cleared the bathroom.’

- RTCs:
 - lack all phi-feature agreement

Radically Truncated Clauses

- in informal spoken and written registers (blogs, forums)
- describe a succession of sub-events (or a single subevent) within a well-defined containing event or situation.

(1) [*Namármost amikor én alud-t-am ott, úgy kezd-t-em, hogy*]
well when I sleep-PST-1SG there so start-PST-1SG that
'So when I was sleeping there, the way I started was
szemét le-visz, szoba rendbe-rak, fürdőszoba el-pakol...
rubbish PRT-carry room PRT-put bathroom PRT-pack
I took out the rubbish, I cleared the room, I cleared the bathroom.'

- RTCs:
 - lack all phi-feature agreement
 - lack all TAM features and they are felicitous only if this missing information can be inferred from the context

Radically Truncated Clauses

- in informal spoken and written registers (blogs, forums)
- describe a succession of sub-events (or a single subevent) within a well-defined containing event or situation.

(1) [*Namármost amikor én alud-t-am ott, úgy kezd-t-em, hogy*]
well when I sleep-PST-1SG there so start-PST-1SG that
'So when I was sleeping there, the way I started was
szemét le-visz, szoba rendbe-rak, fürdőszoba el-pakol...
rubbish PRT-carry room PRT-put bathroom PRT-pack
I took out the rubbish, I cleared the room, I cleared the bathroom.'

- RTCs:
 - lack all phi-feature agreement
 - lack all TAM features and they are felicitous only if this missing information can be inferred from the context.
 - are strictly O PRT V (unlike full sentences, which are V-initial)

Radically Truncated Clauses

Radically Truncated Clauses

- Object in RTCs

Radically Truncated Clauses

- Object in RTCs
 - is in the morphologically unmarked case form (nominal)

Radically Truncated Clauses

- Object in RTCs
 - is in the morphologically unmarked case form (nominal)
 - cannot have a definite article

Radically Truncated Clauses

- Object in RTCs

- is in the morphologically unmarked case form (nominal)

- cannot have a definite article

- is more than a mere N: NumP, PossP, QP, even a CP, and can be pluralized

Radically Truncated Clauses

- Object in RTCs

- is in the morphologically unmarked case form (nominal)
- cannot have a definite article
- is more than a mere N: NumP, PossP, QP, even a CP, and can be pluralized
- is not incorporated or pseudo-incorporated

Radically Truncated Clauses

- Object in RTCs
 - is in the morphologically unmarked case form (nominal)
 - cannot have a definite article
 - is more than a mere N: NumP, PossP, QP, even a CP, and can be pluralized
 - is not incorporated or pseudo-incorporated
- In RTCs:

Radically Truncated Clauses

- Object in RTCs
 - is in the morphologically unmarked case form (nominal)
 - cannot have a definite article
 - is more than a mere N: NumP, PossP, QP, even a CP, and can be pluralized
 - is not incorporated or pseudo-incorporated
- In RTCs:
 - no subject is allowed in transitives or unergatives

Radically Truncated Clauses

- Object in RTCs
 - is in the morphologically unmarked case form (nominal)
 - cannot have a definite article
 - is more than a mere N: NumP, PossP, QP, even a CP, and can be pluralized
 - is not incorporated or pseudo-incorporated
- In RTCs:
 - no subject is allowed in transitives or unergatives
 - subject is allowed in unaccusatives:

Radically Truncated Clauses

- Object in RTCs
 - is in the morphologically unmarked case form (nominal)
 - cannot have a definite article
 - is more than a mere N: NumP, PossP, QP, even a CP, and can be pluralized
 - is not incorporated or pseudo-incorporated
- In RTCs:
 - no subject is allowed in transitives or unergatives
 - subject is allowed in unaccusatives
 - reflexive pronoun objects are unattested

Analysis:

Analysis:

- RTCs are VPs which lack all higher projections including vP, the inflectional domain and the higher functional domain:

Analysis:

- RTCs are VPs which lack all higher projections including vP, the inflectional domain and the higher functional domain:

(2) [CP [NegP [FocP [NegP [PredP [AgrSP [AgrOP [MoodP [TenseP [ModP [vP ext. arg. [VP int. arg. [V' PRT V]]]]]]]]]]]]

Analysis:

- RTCs are VPs which lack all higher projections including vP, the inflectional domain and the higher functional domain:

(2) [~~CP~~ [~~NegP~~ [~~FocP~~ [~~NegP~~ [~~PredP~~ [~~AgrSP~~ [~~AgrOP~~ [~~MoodP~~ [~~TenseP~~ [~~ModP~~ [~~vP~~ ext. arg. [VP int. arg. [V' PRT V]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]

Analysis:

- RTCs are VPs which lack all higher projections including vP, the inflectional domain and the higher functional domain:

(2) ~~[CP [NegP [FocP [NegP [PredP [AgrSP [AgrOP [MoodP [TenseP [ModP [vP ext. arg. [VP int. arg. [V' PRT V]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]~~

- Focusing and negation are out (or very marginal)
- Topicalization and Q-raising qua adjunction are available
- Lack of vP -> no accusative case assignment and the absence of the external argument

Assessment:

Assessment:

- RTCs arise in situations where speakers terminate the derivation of a clause prematurely: VP is sent to PF and LF

Assessment:

- RTCs arise in situations where speakers terminate the derivation of a clause prematurely: VP is sent to PF and LF
- Pros:

Assessment:

- RTCs arise in situations where speakers terminate the derivation of a clause prematurely: VP is sent to PF and LF
- Pros:
 - what can be inferred from the context does not need to be specified

Assessment:

- RTCs arise in situations where speakers terminate the derivation of a clause prematurely: VP is sent to PF and LF
- Pros:
 - what can be inferred from the context does not need to be specified
 - material can be sent to PF and LF earlier

Assessment:

- RTCs arise in situations where speakers terminate the derivation of a clause prematurely: VP is sent to PF and LF
- Pros:
 - what can be inferred from the context does not need to be specified
 - material can be sent to PF and LF earlier
- Cons:

Assessment:

- RTCs arise in situations where speakers terminate the derivation of a clause prematurely: VP is sent to PF and LF
- Pros:
 - what can be inferred from the context does not need to be specified
 - material can be sent to PF and LF earlier
- Cons:
 - breach of the Theta-Criterion (the external arg. role is not assigned)

Assessment:

- RTCs arise in situations where speakers terminate the derivation of a clause prematurely: VP is sent to PF and LF
- Pros:
 - what can be inferred from the context does not need to be specified
 - material can be sent to PF and LF earlier
- Cons:
 - breach of the Theta-Criterion (the external arg. role is not assigned)
 - breach of spell-out by phase (v is not merged, yet VP is spelt out)

Assessment:

- RTCs arise in situations where speakers terminate the derivation of a clause prematurely: VP is sent to PF and LF
- Pros:
 - what can be inferred from the context does not need to be specified
 - material can be sent to PF and LF earlier
- Cons:
 - breach of the Theta-Criterion (the external arg. role is not assigned)
 - breach of spell-out by phase (v is not merged, yet VP is spelled out)
 - breach of semantic interpretability at LF (the external argument slot is unsaturated)

Assessment:

- RTCs arise in situations where speakers terminate the derivation of a clause prematurely: VP is sent to PF and LF
- Pros:
 - what can be inferred from the context does not need to be specified
 - material can be sent to PF and LF earlier
- Cons:
 - breach of the Theta-Criterion (the external arg. role is not assigned)
 - breach of spell-out by phase (v is not merged, yet VP is spelled out)
 - breach of semantic interpretability at LF (the external argument slot is unsaturated)
 - breach of the principle that the numeration needs to be exhausted

Assessment:

- RTCs arise in situations where speakers terminate the derivation of a clause prematurely: VP is sent to PF and LF
- Pros:
 - what can be inferred from the context does not need to be specified
 - material can be sent to PF and LF earlier
- Cons:
 - breach of the Theta-Criterion (the external arg. role is not assigned)
 - breach of spell-out by phase (v is not merged, yet VP is spelled out)
 - breach of semantic interpretability at LF (the external argument slot is unsaturated)
 - breach of the principle that the numeration needs to be exhausted
- RTCs are acceptable but degraded in a colloquial speech situation (4.2 on a 1-to-7 Likert scale): not great, not terrible.

Assessment:

- RTCs arise in situations where speakers terminate the derivation of a clause prematurely: VP is sent to PF and LF
- Pros:
 - what can be inferred from the context does not need to be specified
 - material can be sent to PF and LF earlier
- Cons:
 - breach of the Theta-Criterion (the external arg. role is not assigned)
 - breach of spell-out by phase (v is not merged, yet VP is spelt out)
 - breach of semantic interpretability at LF (the external argument slot is unsaturated)
 - breach of the principle that the numeration needs to be exhausted
- RTCs are acceptable but degraded in a colloquial speech situation (4.2 on a 1-to-7 Likert scale): not great, not terrible.
- RTCs are quite practical, somewhat illegal... and theoretically very revealing.