



ii) with locative adnominal modifiers that appear in the form of a postpositional phrase. However, to avoid ambiguity, postpositional modifiers will only be considered in postnominal position (cf. Szabolcsi & Laczkó 1992: 251-258; Hámori 1954, Honti & H. Varga 2012). The definiteness of the noun phrases in (2) is proven by the objective conjugation of the verb.

(2) *hytett es zerelmett zent fferenczben el vezetteuala* [Jókai C 51]  
 faith and love saint Francis.INE VM has.lost  
 'he has lost the faith in and the love for Saint Francis.'

iii) with complex (clausal) modifiers: prenominal participles and postnominal, finite relative clauses. In (3), the noun phrase includes a participial modifier with a SG3 personal pronoun as its complement:

(3) *Haluan ke· èzt i° čudalkodec / es otèt kouètoçn° monda* [Munich C. 14ra]  
 hearing PRT this Jesus was.amazed and him followers.DAT said  
 'When Jesus heard this, he was amazed and said to those following him.'

(4) *czudakert kyket zent fferenczrewl hallottuala* [Jókai C. 37]  
 miracle.PL.CAUS REL.PL.ACC Saint Francis.DEL has.heard  
 'for the miracles he heard about Saint Francis'

To sum it up, the paper argues that the spreading of the Old Hungarian definite article was also delayed in contexts where the head noun had a complex adnominal modifier, containing either an already anchored element, or performing a reference establishing function (cf. restrictive relative clauses, in terms of Hawkins 1978: 130-138). Note, however, that the pattern is not arbitrary, since these modifiers have much more in common with demonstratives and possessives, than with qualifying or quantifying attributes.

**References:** EGEDI 2013. Grammatical encoding of referentiality in the history of Hungarian In: A. G. Ramat – C. Mauri – P. Molinelli (eds.): *Synchrony and Diachrony: a Dynamic Interface*. Amsterdam, 367-390. EGEDI 2014. The DP-cycle in Hungarian and the functional extension of the noun phrase. In: É. Kiss, K. (ed.): *The Evolution of Functional Left Peripheries in Hungarian Syntax*. Oxford. 56-82. HÁMORI A. 1954. A jelzői értékű hátravetett határozó használatának kérdéséhez. [On the use of postponed adverbials as attributes] *Magyar nyelv* 50: 419-431. S. HÁMORI A. 1998. Jelzős szerkezetek és határozottság [Attributive constructions and definiteness]. In: Büky L. – Forgács T. (szerk.): *A nyelvtörténeti kutatások újabb eredményei I*. Szeged, JATE, 45-52. HAWKINS, J. A. 1978. *Definiteness and indefiniteness*. London: Croom Helm. HONTI L. & H. Varga M. 2012. A hátravetett határozó kialakulásáról (a *Pestre való utazás*-tól a *Pestre utazás*-on át az *utazás Pestre* szerkezetig). *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* 19: 45-57. IMRE S. 1953. A határozott névelő használata a Bécsi Kódexben [The use of the definite article in Vienna Codex]. *Magyar Nyelv* 49: 348-359. SZABOLCSI A. & Laczkó T. 1992. A főnévi csoport szerkezete [The structure of the noun phrase]. In: Kiefer F. (szerk.) *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan I. Mondattan*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 179-298. RIJKHOFF, J. 2001. Dimensions of adnominal modification. In: Haspelmath, M. et al. (ed.) *Language Typology and Language Universals*. HSK Band 20.1. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter. 522-533. RIJKHOFF, J. 2002. *The Noun Phrase*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.