

Kerstin Schwabe / Karolina Zuchewicz
NP + infinitival and participial clausal constructions in German, English, Italian,
Hungarian, and Polish

Keywords: Small Clause, Acl, Exceptional Case Marking, Subject-to-Object-Raising

In G, E, I, and H there are constructions with accusative NPs being the external argument of an infinitival, (1) to (4). In P these accusative NPs can only co-occur with an adjectival participle, (5), a construction also occurring in E, (6). The talk compares the syntactic and semantic structure of these constructions focussing on the syntactic category of the non-finite clause, the status of the accusative NP, the status of the infinitive, restructuring effects, and embedding predicates (including aspect).

i. As to G, E, I, and H, the infinitival clause is regarded as a TP, i.e., a small clause. Its accusative NP and infinitival predicate form a unit – [12], [4], [8]. The Acl denotes, according to [4], an eventuality, which prevents it from being negated. Its subject is case marked by the matrix predicate, either by ECM or subject-to-object raising – [10] and [9]. Acl-constructions can show clause union effects, (7). H additionally allows dative subjects in infinitive clauses, the latter only being licensed by impersonal predicates and co-occurring with an agreeing infinitive, (8a), – [3]. In case there is no agreeing infinitive, the Dative NP is the experiencer of the matrix clause, (8b). As for Italian, it allows Nominative subject NPs in the infinitive clause, (9a, b).

ii. As to P, small clause constructions differ structurally from E, G, I and H ones – [6], [7]. P small clauses are realizable by copula constructions with verbal *być* ‘be’ pronominal *to* ‘it’, (10), or “dual” copula elements, (cooccurrence of a pronominal and a verbal element, [1]), varying with respect to selectional restrictions (part of speech or case within complement phrases, extraction possibilities, [1]). The P counterpart to the Acl-constructions is the secondary predication over an accusative object via an adjectival present participle, (5), (11) and (12). The adjectival participle construction is systematically paraphrasable via clauses introduced by *jak* ‘how’ (11') and (12'). In Polish, adjectival phrases like *recytującego* *wiersz* ‘reciting’, (11), and *wracającego z podróży* ‘returning’, (12), clearly function as adjuncts of the accusative object *go* ‘him’. In our talk, we will compare this P view to languages with typical Acl-constructions, where the Acl-clause is standardly analyzed as a complement of a matrix verb.

- (1) G: Ich höre [ihn kommen]
- (2) a. E: They believe [him to be innocent]. [8]
b. E: A reporter saw [Senator Sleaze leave Benny's Bunny Bar]. [8]
- (3) I: Maria ha sentito [Piero suonare il pianoforte].
Maria have.3SG hear.PTCP Piero play.INF DEF piano [9]
- (4) H: Max hallja [a fiút zongorázni]
Max hear.DEF.3SG DEF boy.ACC piano play.INF
- (5) P: Ania (u-)słyszała [go recytującego wiersz].
Ania (PFV-)hear.IPFV.PST.3SG.F he.ACC recite.PTCP.PR.M.ACC poem
- (6) E: Mary saw [Paul leaving the house]. [5]

- (7) I: L'ho visto uscire.
M.3SG=have.1SG see.PTCP geh.INF
- (8) a. H: Fontos volt [Péternek olvasnia].
important be.PST.3SG Péter.DAT read.INF.3SG [2]
- b. H: Jánosnak muszáj [PRO_i otthon tártózkodni].
János.DAT necessary home stay.INF [3]
- (9) a. I: Ritengo [esser Piero uno dei nostri più validi sostenitori].
consider.1SG be.INF Piero.NOM NDEF.3SG DEF 1SG.PL most valuable supporters
- b. I: Gianni odierrebbe [andare solo lui a Milano].
Gianni hate.COND.3SG go.INF only M.NOM.3SG to Milano [11]
- (10) P: Magda to jest moja ulubiona baletnica.
Magda it be.IPFV.PRS.3SG my.F favourite.F ballet.dancer.F
- (11) P: Ania (u-)słyszała[NP[NP go [AP recytującego wiersz]].
Ania (PFV-)hear.IPFV.PST.3SG.F he.ACC recite.PTCP.PR.M.ACC poem
- (12) P: Zosia widziała [NP[NP go [AP wracającego z podróży]].
Zosia see.IPFV.PST.3SG.F he.ACC return.PTCP.PR.M.ACC from.journey
- (11')P: Ania (u-)słyszała go [jak recytował wiersz].
Ania (PFV-)hear.IPFV.PST.3SG.F he.ACC how recite.PST.3SG.M poem
- (12')P: Zosia widziała go [jak wracał z podróży].
Zosia see.IPFV.PST.3SG.F he.ACC how return.PST.3SG.M from journey

Citko, B. (2008): Small clauses reconsidered: Not so small and not all alike. *Lingua* 118, 261–295. [1]

Kenesei, I./Vago, R. M./Fenyvesi, A. (1998): Hungarian. London/New York: Routledge. [2]

É. Kiss, K. (2002): The Syntax of Hungarian. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [3]

Mittwoch, A. (1990): On the distribution of Bare Infinitive Complements in English. In: *Journal of Linguistics* 1/26: 103-131. [4]

Pires, A. (2006): The Minimalist Syntax of Defective Domains: Gerunds and Infinitives. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publ. [5]

Przepiórkowski, A./Rosen, A. (2005): Czech and Polish raising/control with or without structure sharing. *Research in Language* 3, 33–66. [6]

Przepiórkowski, A. (2004): On case transmission in Polish control and raising constructions. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 39, 103–123. [7]

Radford, A. (2006): Minimalist Syntax Revisited. <http://courses.essex.ac.uk/lg/lg514> [8]

Renzi, P./Salvi, G./Cardinaletto, A. (2001): Grande grammatica italiana· di consultazione, II. I sintagini verbale, aggettivale, avverbiale. La subordinazione. Bologna: Il Mulino. [9]

Runner, J. T./Moulton, K. (2017): The Accusative Plus Infinitive Construction in English. In: Everaert, M./van Riemsdijk, H. C., Hoboken: Jon Wiley & Sons. [10]

Szabolcsi, A. (1992a): Overt Nominative Subjects in Infinitival Complements Cross-linguistically: Data, Diagnostics, and Preliminary Analysis. [11]

Zifonun, G./Hoffmann, L./Strecker, B. (1997): Grammatik der deutschen Sprache. 3 Bde. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter. [12]

| | |
|---|--|
| Kerstin Schwabe Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache schwabe@ids-mannheim.de | Karolina Zuchewicz Universität Leipzig Karolina.zuchewicz@uni-leipzig.de |
|---|--|