

Hungarian external causatives: monoclausal but bi-eventive

In two recent papers, Horváth & Sioni (H&S, 2008; to appear) argue for a lexical treatment of Hungarian external (-*tAt*) causatives, as well against the viability of any non-lexical treatment in general. In this paper I take issue with them on their conclusion, as well as their argumentation, to show that (i) several of their arguments are empirically unfounded, therefore (ii) their general conclusion is unwarranted, and in fact, (iii) the *genuine* data definitely allow for a non-lexical treatment, the essentials of which will also be spelt out.

H&S's main thrust is this: both Hungarian (H) and Japanese (J) form external causatives morphologically, but (their data seems to indicate) they differ crucially and systematically: Japanese causatives display various biclausality effects, which the Hungarian ones don't. Hence (their argument goes) Hungarian causatives only involve a single event and causativization affects the whole of the predicate with its theta-grid as a lexical operation, leaving no room for syntactic derivation à la Harley (2006) or Pykkänen (2002). In the first part of the paper I'll go through their arguments, one by one, and show that in some key cases they ignore important data that, at the end of the day, invalidate their point. In particular:

- They use data on controlling participial subjects in J causatives to show that there are two subject roles involved, hence two clause (or rather: event) domains: (1a). But H data (1b) display the same effect – cf. (1c) which shows that the object cannot control the participial subject in this constructions. → H is *not* unlike J in this respect.
- H&S erroneously assume that in H causatives the core event cannot be adverbially modified: while they are right in that subject-oriented adverbials are unavailable for the causee, other adverbials like frequency or restitutive adverbial modification can affect the core event: (2)
- H&S try to build upon Reinhart's (2002) point that it is a key property of lexically derived causatives that the causer can only be an agent (one with a 'mental state'); again, they obviously ignore H data where the external causer is *not* an agent: (3), so the necessity link to lexicality does not exist.

At the same time, H&S correctly diagnose the absence of two *clauses* in this construction, as far as the full clausal functional structure is concerned, e.g.: there is only one negation domain, and there is a single binding domain. These considerations, when viewed together, point towards the conclusion that Hungarian external causatives are *not biclausal*, but their monoclausal structure has a *multilayered predicate phrase*, such that it includes two event domains (one for the core event and one for the causation event), and this structure and its properties are clearly derivable in an antilexicalist framework, at least as well as in the lexical model advocated by H&S.

I therefore propose (i) that H&S's arguments for the untenability of a non-lexical derivation of H -*tAt* causatives lack force, and (ii) that instead of H&S's lexical account there is a possible non-lexical way to derive the construction along the following lines:

- A rich decompositional predicate structure is assumed (building upon Kratzer 1996, Marantz 2001), as in (4), where *v* is the verbalizing affix, responsible (among others) for the ergative/transitive alternation (e.g.: *gur-ul* 'roll.ERG' vs. *gur-ít* 'roll-TR'), C-INT is the component introducing internal causation, i.e. eventivity and agentivity, and *Voice* introduces an external argument. The affixal category CAUS (spelt out as -*tAt*) takes this whole extended predicate domain as its complement, itself projecting its own external argument, the causer.
- This way, we have two event domains: one of CAUS, the event of causation, and one of C-INT, the core event, both modifiable separately in principle (c.f. (2)), and two 'subject roles' (i.e., external arguments) as well, giving rise to the ambiguity type in (1b). The absence of subject-oriented modification to the causee follows on the assumption that

