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1. Introduction

Two big projects in Budapest and my (relatively new) postdoc project

- „Comprehensive Grammar Resources: Hungarian” (OTKA/NKFIH No. 100804 and 120073)
- „Generative Diachronic Syntax of Hungarian 1 & 2” (OTKA/NKFIH No. 78074 and 112057)
- my postdoctoral grant „Where is the Result? Decomposing the argument structure of Hungarian resultatives and motion predicates” (NKFI PD 121386).

Topics

- grammaticalization of adpositions and the P-cycle: postpositions, case suffixes, particles
- word order of verb and verb modifiers in earlier stages of the language
- synchronic: PPs, copular clauses, secondary predicates, complex events

2. PPs in Hungarian synchronically: A brief overview

Adpositions in Hungarian

- postpositions (and prepositions to some extent)
- case markers
- particles
- adverbs

Two types of postpositions

- case-like
(1) a híd alatt
the bridge under.at
‘under the bridge’

(2) (én) alatt-am
I under.at-1SG
‘under me’

• case-assigning

(3) a fá-(hoz) közel
the tree-ALL close.to
‘close to the tree’

(4) (én) hozz-ám közel
I ALL-1SG close.to
‘close to me’

• Case-like Ps are often in triplets

(5) a. a ház előtt
the house front.at
‘in front of the house’
b. a ház elé
the house front.to
‘(to) in front of the house’
c. a ház elől
the house front.from
‘(from) in front of the house’

Oblique case suffixes

(6) spatial
a. a kert-ben
the garden-INE
‘in the garden’
b. a kert-be
the garden-ILL
‘into the garden’
c. a kert-böl
the garden-ELA
‘from/out of the garden’

(7) other
Mari-val
Mary-INS
‘with Mary’

Particles

(8) a. A labda be-gurult az ágy alá.
the ball into-rolled the bed under.to
‘The ball rolled under the bed.’
b. János meg-találta a labdá-t.
John MEG-found the ball-ACC
‘John found the ball.’

(9) Mari át-jött.
Mary over-came
‘Mary came over (to our place).’
Adverbs

(10) A labda bent van (a kapu-ban).
the ball inside is (the goal-INE)
'The ball is in (the goal).'</n
Note: the syntax of particles

- particles are separable; they are immediately preverbal in so-called neutral sentences
- particles are (mostly) inserted in a PP under V as secondary predicates (but see Hegedűs & Dékány 2017 for some exceptions), they introduce internal arguments (É. Kiss 2006, Surányi 2009), e.g. (11)
- they move to the preverbal position via a phrasal movement to create complex predicates (e.g. É. Kiss 2006), this may be disrupted by further movements (e.g. negation, (12))

(11) Jutka át-úsztta a folyó-t.
Judith across-swam the river-ACC
'Judith swam across the river.'

(12) János nem találta meg a labdá-t.
John not found PRT the ball-ACC
'John didn’t find the ball.'

3. The structure of PPs


(13) $pP > PathP > PlaceP > AxPartP > DP$

(14)

- $p$: functional adposition, its specifier hosts the Figure

---

$^1$Dékány & Hegedűs (2015) actually assume a slightly larger structure with an additional functional layer for an ‘escape hatch’ on the top in order to derive all word order variation and extraction possibilities.
Path is above Place (semantically built on it; also cross-linguistic morphological order)

(15) a. a kert-en át
the garden-SUP over
‘across the garden’
b. elalvás előtt-re
falling.asleep before.at-SUB
‘for (the time) before going to sleep’
c. a ház mögött-re
the house behind.at-SUB
‘for (the area) behind the house’

AxPart: has both nominal and adpositional properties

4. Grammaticalization paths

4.1. Grammaticalization from possessives

- Proto-Hungarian: various case-marked possessee nouns began to grammaticalize into postpositions
- The original structure was the one in (16):

(16) Possessor + Possessee + spatial CASE (locaitive: -l/-n; goal: -á/-é; source: -l)

(17) ez homus vilag timmuce-bel-e-ul
this false world prison.cell.POSS-inside-POSS-ABL
‘out of the prison cell of this insincere world’ (Funeral Sermon and Prayer, cca. 1195)

Old Hungarian possessive+directional case

(18) a kenyér bel-e
the bread inside-POSS
‘inside of a loaf’

Modern Hungarian possessive

4.1.1. Grammaticalization from possessives - Step 1

- Certain relational nouns, e.g. top, bottom, side, front, back, gut, chest etc. (Svenonius 2006: „axial parts”), were losing their nominal properties (Hegedus 2015)
- in Old Hungarian: dative + some possessive marking are still possible (Zsilinszky 1991)

(19) a. zemey elewt
eye-POSS.3SG-PL front.at
‘in front of his eyes’ (Jókai Codex 121, 1372/1448)
b. baratok-nak elewtt-e  
brothers-DAT front.at-POSS  
‘in front of (the) brothers’ (Jókai C. 84)

\[(20)\] Possessor + Possessee + CASE  
\[\downarrow \quad \downarrow\]  
Ground + [AxialPart + CASE] 

\[(21)\] vilag-bel-e  
world-inside-into  
‘into (the) world’ (Funeral Sermon and Prayer) 

\[(22)\] paris-bal-ol  
Paris-inside-ABL  
from Paris  
Old Hungarian (Jókai C. 28) 

### 4.1.2. Grammaticalization from possessives - Step 2

- The [AxialPart + CASE] was reanalyzed into a monomorphemic P; the original possessor is the Ground complement of the new P (see Lehmann 2015 [1995]) 

\[(23)\] az lang-bol  
the flame-ELA  
‘out of the flame’ (Jókai Cod. 43) 

\[(24)\] a. uromc sceine eleut  
Lord.POSS.1PL face.POSS front.at  
‘before our Lord’  
(Funeral Sermon and Prayer) 

\[(24)\] b. nekyk ele  
DAT.3PL before.to  
‘(to) before them’ (Jókai C. 21) 

\[(24)\] c. o orcaioc élöl  
they face-POSS.3PL before.from  
‘from before their faces’ (Vienna C. 32, 1416/1450) 

### 4.1.3. Grammaticalization from possessives - Step 3

- In some cases the morphologically independent P was reanalyzed as a bound case suffix (monosyllabic; these exhibit vowel harmony) 

\[(25)\] paradisum-ben  
Paradise-INE  
‘in Paradise’ (Funeral Sermon and Prayer) 

\[(26)\] ez vilag-bol  
this world-ELA  
‘from this world’ (Jókai C. 62) 

### 4.2. Grammaticalization path (Hegedűs 2015)

\[(27)\] a. zemey elewtt  
eye-POSS.3SG-PL front.at
‘in front of his eyes’ (Jókai C. 121)
b. baratok-nak elewtt-e
   brothers-DAT front.at-POSS
   ‘in front of (the) brothers’ (Jókai C. 84)

(28) PlaceP
    AxPartP
    Place
    \[
    \text{DP} \quad \text{Place} \quad \text{-t(-e)}
    \]
    zemey
    elew-
    baratoknak

(29) a. paradisum-ben
Paradise-in
   ‘in Paradise’ (Funeral Sermon and Prayer)
b. PlaceP
    DP
    Place
    \[
    \text{paradisum} \quad \text{-ben}
    \]

(30) a. vilagbele
world-into
   ‘into (the) world’ (Funeral Sermon and Prayer)
b. PathP
    PlaceP
    Path
    \[
    \text{DP} \quad \text{Place} \quad \text{-bele}
    \]
    vilag

- this is part of the P-cycle (Waters 2009; e.g. in front of, outside etc.): Ps grammaticalize, later the lower head may be filled again (see below)

- Roberts and Roussou (2003): P elements completely grammaticalize when they lose their spatial meaning

**New case-like postpositions from possessive structures**

- normally, case-like Ps are perceived by speakers as monomorphemic; they do not contain possessive marking any more

- a few case-like Ps still have a transparent possessive structure: base + possessive marking + oblique case

- these are still complex adpositions, with AxPart and Place/Path filled (Hegedűs & Dékány 2016)

  e.g. számára, nészre: ‘for’ – these are not spatial
(31) X szám-á-ra, X rész-é-re
X number-POSS-SUB, X part-POSS-SUB
both: ‘for X’

(32) én szám-om-ra, ti szám-otok-ra
I number-POSS.1SG-SUB you.pl number-POSS.2PL-SUB
‘for me, for you(pl)’

(33) én rész-em-re, ti rész-ek-re
I part-POSS.1SG-SUB you.pl part-POSS.2PL-SUB
‘for me, for you(pl)’

cf. the old ones:

(34) én fel-ett-em
I top-LOC-POSS.1SG
‘above me’

e.g. helyében: ‘in X’s shoes/place’ – spatial origin

(35) X hely-é-ben
X place-POSS-INE
‘in X’s place/shoes’

(36) én hely-em-ben, ti hely-etek-ben
I place-POSS.1SG-INE you.pl place-POSS.2PL-INE
‘in my shoes, in your(pl) shoes’

• still transparent possessive structures, but behave a bit differently

(37) a. János hely-é-ben nem tenném ezt.
John place-POSS-INE not do.COND.1SG this.ACC
‘In John’s place/if I were John, I wouldn’t do this.’

b. ?János-nak a hely-é-ben nem tenném ezt.
John-DAT the place-POSS-INE not do.COND.1SG this.ACC
‘In John’s place/if I were John, I wouldn’t do this.’

c. *János-nak nem tenném ezt a hely-é-ben.
John-DAT not do.COND.1SG this.ACC the place-POSS-INE
‘In John’s place/if I were John, I wouldn’t do this.’

4.3. Grammaticalization from adjuncts

• a PP with a case suffix can be modified by an appositive (locative or directional) PP
  adjunct containing only a free-standing adposition
  → loose relationship between the adposition and the case marked DP

(38) fy-al usve
son.INS together
‘together with (her) son’
(Königsberg Fragment, cca. 1350)

(39) az udvar-on kint
the yard-SUP outside
‘outside in the yard’
• an adjunct can grammaticalize into a head on the main projection line in line with Van Gelderen’s (2004) Head Preference Principle

• proposal: some adpositions adjoined to pP/PathP were reanalyzed as a head on the main projection line: as the p/Path head itself

• the original adjunct then takes the case marked noun phrase (a PP) as its complement, a very local relationship → this resulted in complex adpositional phrases

• Old Hungarian has very few such postpositions, many of them emerged in the Middle Hungarian period (1526-1772) or later

(40) őn város-om-nac kapu-i-n bélől
     I city-POS.1SG-DAT gate-POS.PL-SUP inside
     lit. ‘within the gates of my city’ (Vienna C. 7)

(41)

4.4. Prepositions from postpositions

• Even the older ones are not that old (they are secondary to the grammaticalization of case suffixes)

• No new complex Ps from adjunctions?

• Harder to see the change?

4.4. Prepositions from postpositions

• In Old Hungarian and Middle Hungarian all case assigning adpositions are postpositions.

• In Modern Hungarian some case-assigning Ps can also be prepositional in some contexts.
This correlates with their exteractability and their use as particles (Dékány & Hegedűs 2015)

\[(43)\] a fal-on át the wall-SUP through ‘through the wall’

\[(44)\] át a fal-on through the wall-SUP ‘through the wall’

\[(45)\] Át a hid-on a kocsikkal! across the bridge-sup the cars-instr ‘Across the bridge with the cars!’

**pP: headedness**

- pP is changing from a head-final to a head-initial projection (Dékány & Hegedűs 2015), Place/PathP are head-final, pP is head-initial
- Interestingly this is the opposite of German ‘circumpositions’, where the p head has been argued to be head final (Van Rimesdijk 1990, 1998)
- This is possibly a late follow-up of the large scale head-last to head-first change on the clausal and the phrasal level that happened in OH and MidH (É. Kiss 2014)
- The new configuration (head-initial pP, head-final Path/PlaceP) obeys the Final-over-Final Condition of Biberauer et al. (2015)

### 5. Grammaticalization of particles

- particles are generated in p in the extended structure

\[(46)\] \(pP > \text{PathP} > \text{PlaceP} > \text{AxPartP} > \text{DP}\)

- the oldest particles are: *meg* ‘orig. back, now only telicizer’, *el* ‘away’, *be* ‘into’, *ki* ‘out’, *fel* ‘up’, *le* ‘down’
- old particles are monomorphemic; we can’t see their grammaticalization only their semantic bleaching to some extent

\[(47)\] Es félelét véuőn álmoćban hog ne mennenec meg herodéshéz and reply taken dream-POSS.3PL-INE that not go.COND-3PL back Herod.to ‘And being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod’ (Munich C. 9ra, 1466)

\[(48)\] Tahat meg-haga otet az ördög then PRT-left him the devil Then the devil leaveth him’ (Munich C. 10ra)

\[(49)\] Ottan el-hagy a hewtet az erdeg there away-left him the devil Then the devil leaveth him’ (Jordánszky C. 363, 1516-19)

- *meg* is the only one that has no productive spatial use in Modern Hungarian
New particles from case marked DPs

- newer particles are more transparently complex

\[(51)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & [PathP\ [_{DP\ hát\ ]\ -ra\ ]} & \text{‘behind’} \\
\text{b. } & [PathP\ [_{DP\ fél\ ]\ -re\ ]} & \text{‘aside, mis-V’} \\
\text{c. } & [PathP\ [_{DP\ vég\ ]\ -be\ ]} & \text{‘complete’}
\end{align*}
\]

\(agy\)on ‘to death / to exhaustion’ is one of the newest particles (D. Mátai 2007); speakers still perceive it as having an N+CASE internal structure, but the meaning is bleached (Hegedüs & Dékány 2015)

\[(52)\]
\[
\text{agy-on-ver valaki-t} \\
\text{brain-SUP beat somebody-ACC} \\
\text{‘hit somebody on the head’}
\]

\[(53)\]
\[
\text{agy-on-ver valaki-t} \\
\text{brain-SUP beat somebody-ACC} \\
\text{‘beat somebody to death’}
\]

\[(54)\]
\[
\text{agy-on-dicsér valaki-t} \\
\text{brain-SUP praise somebody-ACC} \\
\text{‘praise somebody to the skies / heap praises on somebody’}
\]

Note: morphologically it is locative (with a superessive case); interestingly in some cases, we find it with a sublative suffix added in its particle use:

\[(55)\]
\[
\text{Ezt már agyon-ra ismételték.} \\
\text{this.ACC already to.death-SUB repeated} \\
\text{This has been repeated to death.’}
\]

\(bele\) ‘into’, \(ná\) ‘onto’, \(hozzá\) to’, \(neki\) to’ → they are more complex: have agreement morphology (cf. Ürögdi 2003, Surányi 2009, Rákosi & Laczkó 2011 a.o.)

\[(56)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{János rá-képett a lábam-ra.} & \text{John onto(3SG)-stepped the foot.POSS.1SG-SUB} \\
& \text{John stepped on my foot} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Az autó neki-ment a fal-nak.} & \text{the car to(3SG)-went the wall-DAT} \\
& \text{The car drove into the wall.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(57)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{János csak RÁ-D nézett rá-d.} & \text{John only SUB-2SG looked SUB-2SG} \\
& \text{John only looked at YOU.’}
\end{align*}
\]
b. Az a magas férfi csak NEK-EM jött nekem.
   that the tall man only DAT-1SG came DAT-1SG
   That tall man only bumped into ME.

- earliest possible examples are from 16-18th c., but they could have been adjunction structures too

(58) nek-i megény a Fatens-nek
dat-3SG go.3SG the witness-DAT
   ‘he attacks (lit. goes to) the witness
   (Witch trial 59, before 1712)

(59) Es rea tekonte wr Isten gedeon vytez-re
   and onto looked.3sg Lord God Gideon soldier-sub
   ‘and the Lord glanced upon Gideon the valiant’ (Jordánszky Codex 329, 1516–1519)

6. Lexicalizing p/Path: complex events

- Hungarian is a strong (or strict) satellite-framed language (see also Acedo-Matellán 2016)

- secondary predicates are all expressed with an adpositional element (Hegedüs 2013): sublative/translative suffix; adverbial suffix; dative suffix

(60) a. János zöld-re festette az ajtó-t.
   John green-SUB painted the door-ACC
   ‘John painted the door green.’

b. János le-festette az ajtó-t.
   John down-painted the door-ACC
   ‘John painted the door.’

(61) A vihar ijesztő-vé vált.
   the storm scary-TRANS turn
   The storm turned scary.’

(62) János FEKETÉ-N issza a kávé-t.
   John black-ADV drink the coffee-ACC
   ‘John drinks coffee black.’

(63) Péter okos-nak tartja Marit.
   Peter clever-DAT consider Mary.ACC
   ‘Peter considers Mary clever.’

- generally cross-linguistically telic verbs require a particle in Hungarian, e.g. achievement verbs

(64) a. A váza el-tört.
   the vase away-broke
   The vase broke.’

b. A főszereplő meg-halt.
   the main.character PRT-died
   The main character died.’
• decomposing argument structure below V (Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002; Borer 2005, Ramchand 2008 etc.)

\[(65) \quad [V_P \mid V \mid p_p \text{INT-ARG} \mid P \mid N ||||]\]

• Does P incorporate into V (in the sense of Hale & Keyser; not necessarily via movement)? Put differently: can the verb lexicalize P+V? (Mateu 2012)

• N to P to V incorporation is also possible (again, not necessarily via movement), e.g. Hale & Keyser (2002) analyze denominal verbs like saddle (the horse), box (the books) that way.

• Hungarian is a more strictly satellite-framed language than English: incorporation of result does not seem to be an option at all

• this general inability to express result/goal has been formulated by É. Kiss (2006) as a lexical/semantic property of Hungarian verbs, which are said to be inherently atelic and in need of another telicizer to express events that have an end-point (an observation made in various places)

• Proposal in my PD project: it is a structural property, V does not incorporate/lexicalize P in a decomposed structure, there is no N to P to V incorporation either

• in an extended PP structure, a \(p\) or a Path head has to be lexicalized under V

• decomposing the PP in the complement of V, makes it possible to further distinguish particles (\(p\)) and other P heads structurally

\[(66) \quad [V_P \mid V \mid p_p \text{INT-ARG} \mid p \mid \text{PathP Path PlaceP} ||||]\]

• variation may occur in the optionality of \(p\) when the Path is filled; this variation is related to movement to \(p\) and possible grammaticalization, i.e., merger in the higher head

7. Conclusions

• case-like Ps grammaticalized in possessive constructions with a directional case marker; some case-like Ps then grammaticalized into case markers (became completely bound morphemes)

• case-assigning Ps grammaticalized from adjuncts to case marked noun phrases

• particles grammaticalize from Path-denoting Ps (that were more complex originally)

• there is a strong tendency to fill the \(p\) head in complex events

• Hungarian is a strong s-framed language: \(p\) has to be lexicalized separately from V
Sources
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