

From Proto-Hungarian SOV to Old Hungarian Top Foc V X*

Katalin É. Kiss

Pázmány Péter Catholic University

and

Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Budapest, Benczúr utca 33, H-1112 Hungary

ekiss@nytud.hu

From Proto-Hungarian SOV to Old Hungarian Top Foc V X*¹

Abstract: This paper argues that Hungarian underwent a word order change from SOV to Top Foc V X* prior to its documented history beginning in 1192. Proto-Hungarian SOV is reconstructed primarily on the basis of shared constructions of archaic Old Hungarian, and Khanty and Mansi, the sister languages of Hungarian. The most likely scenario of the change from head-final to head-initial was the spreading of right dislocation, and the reanalysis of right dislocated elements by new generations of speakers as arguments in situ. In Hungarian – as opposed to Khanty and Mansi – right dislocation was facilitated by the extension of differential object marking to all direct objects. The change in basic word order initiated the restructuring of other parts of Hungarian grammar as well, which is a still ongoing process.

Key words: *diachronic syntax, OV-VO change, right dislocation, Uralic, Khanty, Mansi,*

1. Introduction

The question of whether syntactic reconstruction is possible at all, and, in case it is attempted, what methodology it should employ, has been much discussed recently. Lightfoot (2002) claims that in the absence of a theory of linguistic change, we have no reliable means of reconstructing a proto-language with no written records. Campbell and Harris (2002), and several authors in Ferraresi & Goldbach's (2008) *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction*, on the contrary, argue for the possibility of syntactic reconstruction. Campbell and Harris (2002), as well as Pires and Thomason (2008) claim that the methodology of comparative linguistics, based on correspondence sets, can be extended to syntax, and directionality generalizations represent reliable constraints on possible linguistic changes. Von Mengden (2008) proposes basing syntactic reconstruction on typological generalizations, specifically, on implicational universals. Another possibility raised by him is to establish cross-linguistic regularities of grammaticalization, and then to reconstruct proto-syntax by 'undoing' grammaticalization processes.

This paper argues that we have sufficient evidence to reconstruct the basic word order of Proto-Hungarian, the predecessor of present-day Hungarian in the period between 1192, the time when the first surviving coherent Hungarian text was written (or copied), and 500 BC,

¹ I owe thanks to Katalin Gugán and the reviewers of *Diachronica* for their useful comments on an earlier version of this paper, as well as to OTKA, the Hungarian National Scientific Research Grant, which supported the research reported on in this paper by grant 78074.

the time when Hungarian split off the Ugric branch of the Uralic language family.² What makes reconstruction possible is the fact that certain archaic constructions of early Old Hungarian documents, quickly disappearing from the language, seem to have preserved Proto-Hungarian patterns, and what is more, these patterns converge with the corresponding constructions of present-day Khanty and Mansi (Ostyak and Vogul), the Ugric sister languages of Hungarian. The shared constructions of archaic Old Hungarian, Khanty and Mansi are likely to have originated in the period of Ugric unity, and to have characterized Hungarian also in the Proto-Hungarian period. The SOV sentence structure hypothesized for Proto-Hungarian is supported by typological (directionality) generalizations as well.

In a somewhat more speculative vein, the paper also attempts to reconstruct the Proto-Hungarian construction that was generated by an SOV grammar but came to be analyzed as the output of a VO grammar by new generations of speakers. In this case, the method of reconstruction is what von Mengden (2008) calls “travelling backwards on the pathway of grammaticalization”. It is claimed that two apparently inexplicable properties of present-day Hungarian (its free postverbal argument order, and the impossibility of non-referential, predicative nominals in postverbal position) get a natural explanation if these features are fossilized properties of a construction derived from SOV by right dislocation/rightward topicalization.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses the evidence for Proto-Hungarian being SOV. Section 3 attempts to reconstruct how the Proto-Hungarian SOV sentence structure came to be reanalyzed as underlyingly V-initial. Section 4 argues that the first surviving Old Hungarian text, the Funeral Sermon and Prayer from 1192-95, already displays the same Top Foc V X* basic word order as Modern Hungarian. Section 5 demonstrates that the change of basic SOV to Top Foc V X* has been followed by a drift from head-final to head-initial in other areas of grammar as well.

2. Evidence for Proto-Hungarian SOV

Proto-Hungarian, the language that split off the Ugric branch of the Uralic family at about 500 BC, representing the predecessor of Old Hungarian, a language documented from the end of the 12th century, has no written relics; nevertheless, we can form plausible hypotheses about

² This notion of Proto-Hungarian, meaning ‘Hungarian in its pre-documented period’, does not exactly correspond to the term *ősmagyar* ‘Ancient Hungarian’ in Hungarian linguistic tradition. In Hungarian historical linguistics, the Ancient Hungarian period ends in 896, the year when Hungarian tribes settled down in the Carpathian Basin. The Hungarian language of the first three hundred years of the subsequent Old Hungarian period is only documented by fragments (mostly person names and place names) embedded in Latin and Greek texts, hence it is also Proto-Hungarian for me.

its syntax. Our sources of evidence are the properties of the other two daughter languages of Proto-Ugric, and converging properties of the most archaic constructions of the first Old Hungarian texts. The SOV reconstructed for Proto-Hungarian by their comparison will also be supported by typological generalizations.

2.1. The sister languages of Hungarian are SOV

The languages most closely related to Hungarian, the Ob-Ugric Khanty (Ostyak) and Mansi (Vogul) are strict SOV languages, similar to the other Siberian members of the Uralic family. The original basic order of major constituents in the Uralic family is generally assumed to have been SOV (cf. Vilkuna 1998: 178), i.e., Khanty and Mansi may well have preserved the basic word order of the proto-language. (The SVO orders of several European Uralic languages are generally believed to be innovations, which may have arisen under the influence of Indo-European languages, primarily Scandinavian and Russian. In the case of Mordvin and Komi, the decrease of SOV and the spreading of SVO can be documented by folklore texts collected in the 19th century or preserved orally – see Vilkuna (1998: 181) citing Saarinen (1991) about Mordvin, and Rédei (1978) about Komi.) If Khanty and Mansi have preserved the basic word order of Proto-Uralic, then the change from SOV to Top Foc V X* must have taken place in the separate life of Hungarian.

The S(X)OV order in Khanty and Mansi is so strict that a D-structure object can only undergo topic movement via the passivization of the sentence – see the discussion of (18) below. The obligatoriness of S(X)OV is obviously related to the fact that Khanty does not morphologically mark objects other than personal pronouns, and Mansi does not morphologically mark indefinite objects. The differential object marking attested in Mansi dialects is generally claimed to encode the definiteness of the object, as shown by the glossing of the following example of Collinder (1960)³:

(1) *kwal*: “house.NOM/house.ACC”;

kwal-me: “the house-ACC” (Collinder 1960, cited by Marcantio 1985: 285)

According to Marcantonio (1985), however, the morpheme often appearing on definite objects in Mansi serves to mark the topic role of the object. Nikolaeva’s (1999, 2001) analysis of Khanty differential verb-object agreement, illustrated in (2a,b) below, leads to a similar –

³ For a recent overview of object marking in the Ugric languages, see Kulonen (1997).

but more explicit – conclusion: she presents a large amount of convincing evidence indicating that Khanty differential object agreement, elicited seemingly optionally by definite objects, in fact encodes the secondary topic function of the object in SOV sentences.⁴ Compare:

(2) a. *ku rit tus-Ø*
man-NOM boat-NOM carried-INDEF.3SG⁵
“The man carried a boat.”

b. *ku rit tus-t*
man-NOM boat-NOM carried-DEF.3SG
“The man carried the boat. [The boat, the man was carrying.]”

(Gulya (1970: 81), cited by Marcantonio (1985: 274))

What is crucial for the present discussion is that the object in these languages is often – or in Khanty, nearly always – unmarked morphologically, and grammatical functions are encoded by the invariant positions of the subject and the object in a strictly S(X)OV structure.

2.2. SOV relics in Old Hungarian

2.2.1. SOV order with a morphologically unmarked object in participial clauses

The SOV order attested in the sister languages of Hungarian is also detectable in certain archaisms of Old Hungarian documents, including an SOV clause type with a morphologically unmarked object, which confirms the hypothesis that the SOV order was a Proto-Ugric feature, preserved (for a while, at least) in Proto-Hungarian as well.

Whereas Old Hungarian already had a general accusative case ending (the morpheme *-t*), the first surviving Hungarian codices, among them Jókai Codex, written around 1370 and copied around 1448, and the Vienna and Munich Codices, including books of the Bible translated in 1416-1435 and copied in 1450 and 1466, respectively, sporadically still contain a non-finite SOV construction whose object bears no accusative case. As the examples below indicate, the caseless object of this clause type is not an incorporated argument, as it can be

⁴ Nikolaeva’s (2001) investigation of the discourse function of agreeing objects in Khanty is based on her own fieldwork and on the analysis of more than a thousand sentences from folklore texts in Pápay (1906-1908). What she shows is that agreeing objects are contextually given. A contextually new object - whether definite or indefinite - does not agree with the verb, thus sentences answering questions like *What happened? What is new?* never contain an agreeing object. For a detailed discussion of this issue, see É. Kiss (2011b).

⁵ INDEF means ‘indefinite’ conjugation, a verbal paradigm involving no V-object agreement. The verbal paradigm agreeing with a definite object is called ‘definite’ (DEF) conjugation. I indicate whether the verbal suffix is from the definite or indefinite conjugation only when it is relevant for the discussion.

definite (3a), syntactically complex (3b,c), and referential (3a-c) or quantificational (the 2nd clause of 3c).

- (3) a. [*ø è gondoluan*] *yme vrnac angala ièlenec nèki*
 he this-Ø thinking lo Lord's angel appeared he.DAT
 “while he thought on these, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him”
 (Munich Codex, St Matthew 1,20)
- b. [*ø kenček meǵnituan*]⁶ *aianlanac neki aiandokocat*
 they treasure-3PL-Ø unlocking offer-PAST-INDEF.3PL he.DAT presents-ACC
 “having opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts”
 (Munich C., St Matthew 2,11)
- c. *Dè [fèiec lehaituan] [mēdènec èlhaguā] èrøkønc uala*
 but head-3PL-Ø down-turning everyone-PL-Ø leaving struggle-3PL be-PAST
az eberectøl èlzaladnioc
 the people-from off-run-INF-3PL⁷
 “But turning down their heads, leaving everyone, they were struggling to run off
 from the people” (Vienna C., Judith 43,2)

Crucially, whereas Old Hungarian word order is, in general, fairly flexible, the occurrence of a caseless object is always accompanied by a head-final, OV order. The correlation between the lack of structural case and OV order is evident in parallel sentences of subsequent translations of the Bible. (4a) contains a caseless object immediately preceding the non-finite verb (a participle derived by the adverbial suffix *-uan/uen* (Modern Hungarian *-ván/vén*)). In (4b) the object already bears the *-t* accusative suffix, and the word order is VO.

St Matthew 4,20:

- (4) a. *És azok [legottan hálójok meghagyván] követék őtet*

⁶ *ø* (now spelled as *ő*), nondistinct from a singular 3rd person nominative pronoun, stands for *ők* ‘they’. In possessive constructions its *-k* plural suffix is always absent. Its plurality is shown by the plural agreement marker on the possessum. In the Hungarian possessive construction, the possessor is either caseless/nominative, or bears a dative suffix, whereas the possessum bears an agreement suffix, marking the person and number of the possessor.

⁷ In Old Hungarian, non-finite verb forms were very often inflected. The infinitival complements of impersonal verbs are inflected in Modern Hungarian, as well. The inflection that infinitives and participles bear is not the verbal inflection but the agreement paradigm found on the possessum in possessive constructions.

and they immediately net-3PL-Ø PRT-leaving follow-PAST-3PL him
 “And, straightway leaving their net, they followed him” (Munich C. (1416/1466))

- b. *Azok kedyg [legottan el hagywan haloyok-at], kóweteek hewtet*
 they COORD immediately PRT-leaving net-3PL-ACC followed him
 “And, straightway leaving their net, they followed him” (Jordánszky C. (1516-19))

The hypothesis that the sporadic occurrence of caseless referential objects in SOV *-uan/uen* clauses of 14th-15th century codices is an archaism preserved from Proto-Hungarian is also supported by the fact that *-uan/uen* clauses represent the most conservative clause type of Old Hungarian in other respects as well. Their conservative nature is also evident in the case of negation. Hungarian negative pronouns such as *semmi* ‘nothing’, *senki* ‘nobody’, *semmikor* ‘never’ involve an incorporated negative particle, which lost its negative force in the course of the Old Hungarian period, and came to require the presence of an additional negative particle. This newly added negative particle assumed the function of the negative operator, and the negative pronouns came to be interpreted as indefinite pronouns subjected to negative concord (cf. É. Kiss 2011a, Gugán 2012). The negative construction without a separate negative particle already represents a minority pattern in 14th-15th century codices, and it completely disappears by the 16th century. Nevertheless, the *-uan/uen* clauses of Jókai codex (1370/1448) only contain the rare, archaic pattern (É. Kiss 2011a). That is, whereas the majority of the finite negative clauses of Jókai codex show the innovative negative concord structure illustrated in (5), all of its negative *-uan/uen* clauses are of the type illustrated in (6), containing no negative particle:

- (5) *vg̃ hog̃ mendenestewlfoguan semm̃ meg nem j̃ellenek*
 so that altogether nothing PRT not appear-COND-3SG
 “so that nothing at all would [not] appear” (Jókai C., p. 66)

- (6) *mendenestewlfoguan maganac semj̃tt meg tarttuan*
 altogether himself-DAT nothing-ACC PRT keeping
 “keeping nothing at all for himself” (Jókai C., p. 8)

2.2.2. ‘Verb–Auxiliary’ order

Old Hungarian had complex tenses, marking both tense and aspect. The lexical verb bore the aspect morpheme and the agreement morpheme, and an auxiliary (cognate with the copula) bore the tense marker. The auxiliary always immediately followed the V; many scribes, e.g. that of example (7b), did not even leave a space between the V and the auxiliary. The strictly adjacent ‘V Aux’ complex appears to be the relic of a head-final VP preceding the temporal auxiliary in a head-final TP ([_{TP} [_{VP}... V] Aux]).

(7) a. *es odu-tt-a vol-a neki paradisumut hazoa*
 and give-PERF-3SG be-PAST he.DAT Paradise-ACC house-for
 “and had given him Paradise for a house” (Funeral Sermon and Prayer (1192-95))

b. *Kiknç éggic hiua-ttat-ic-ual-a Orphanac & masic Rvtnac*
 who-PL-DAT one call-PASS-3SG-be-PAST Orpha-DAT & other Ruth-DAT
 “one of whom was called Orpha, and the other, Ruth” (Vienna C., Ruth 1,4)

2.2.3. The variable position of the interrogative complementizer *e*

In the strictly SOV sister languages of Hungarian, not only the VP but also the CP is head-final, thus the interrogative complementizer appears clause-finally, cliticized to the V:

(8) a. *tit χujew-ä* (Mansi) b. *nènem tötte ù.tot-á* (Khanty)
 here sleep.1PL-Q wife-1SG there was-Q
 “Do we sleep here?” “Was my wife there?” (Juhász 1991: 501)

In present-day Hungarian, the interrogative particle of *yes-no* questions, which is cognate with the Khanty and Mansi interrogative complementizer, is cliticized to the verb. In the first Old Hungarian codices, however, it still often appears clause-finally, and sometimes is spelled out both at the end of the clause and right-adjacent to the verb. This variation in the position of the interrogative particle suggests that it is the descendant of a clause-final complementizer cliticized to the V. When the VP came to be reanalyzed as head-initial, some speakers interpreted it as a clause-final clitic, others analyzed it as a verbal clitic, yet others resolved this uncertainty by duplicating the particle. That is:

(9) [s ... V]-*e*  a. [s ... V...]-*e*
 b. [s ... V-*e*...]

c. [s ...V-e...]-e

(10) a. *Nemdè kèt vèrèbec adatnac égfel penzen è?*
not two sparrows give-PASS-3PL one-half coin-on Q
“Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing?”
(Munich C., St Matthew 10,29)

b. *Il’les vag è tè?*
Elias are Q you
“Are you Elias?” (Munich C., St John 1,21)

c. *Minemde elfeledheti-e az anya ő kis gyermekét-e?*
whether.or.not forget-POSSIB-3SG-Q the mother her small child-3SG-ACC-Q
“Can the mother forget her small child?”
(Nádor C. (1508), cited by Simonyi (1882: 189))

In sum: Old Hungarian displayed relics of a head-final VP, a head-final TP, and a head-final CP.

2.3. SOV typological features of Hungarian

Although the VP and the functional projections subsuming it have been head-initial throughout the documented history of Modern Hungarian, the language shares many typological features of SOV languages. The lexical layer of the NP is strictly head-final. (The DP layer, which developed in the Old Hungarian period parallel with the evolution of articles, on the other hand, is already head-initial – see Egedi (2011)). The complement of the noun precedes the head – albeit in an adjectivalized form, supplied with an adjectival participle derived from the copula:

(11) a. *fyamhoz ualo menesomet*
son-1SG-to being journey-1SG-ACC
“my journey-ACC to my son” (Kazinczy C. (1526-41), p. 6)

b. [DP a [NP [AdjP *szintaktikai rekonstrukcióról* való [N *vita*]]]
the syntactic reconstruction-about being debate

“the debate about syntactic reconstruction” (Modern Hungarian)

In Modern Hungarian, PP complements can also be adjectivalized by the suffix *-i*:

- (12) *a* [_{PP} *diszkrimináció ellen*] *-i küzdelem*
the discrimination against -ADJ struggle
“the struggle against discrimination”

The possessor also precedes the possessum:

- (13) a. *ig fa gimilcetvl*
one tree fruit-3SG-from
“from the fruit of one tree” (Funeral Sermon and Prayer (1192-95))
- b. [_{DP} *a könyv*] [_{NP} *borítója*]
the book cover-3SG
“the cover of the book” (Modern Hungarian)

In strictly head-final languages, relative clauses – often derived by the gap relativization strategy – also tend to precede the nominal that they modify. We find prenominal non-finite relative clauses in present-day Khanty:

- (14) [*(mä) tini-m-äm*] *loy*
I sell-PASTPART-1SG horse
“the horse I sold” (Nikolaeva 1999: 79)

This pattern was also general in Old Hungarian (15a), and occurs in Modern Hungarian as well (15b):

- (15) a. *es uegéd az [neked zorzoftem] Coronat*
and take-IMP-2SG the you-DAT obtain-PASTPART-1SG crown-ACC
“and take the crown I obtained for you” (Kazinczy C. (1526-41), p. 34)
- b. *A [Kassai Viktor vezette] mérkőzést a spanyol csapat*

the Viktor Kassai officiate-PASTPART-3SG match-ACC the Spanish team-NOM
nyerte meg.

won PRT

“The Spanish team won the match which Viktor Kassai officiated.”

The PP is also head-final in Hungarian, i.e., Hungarian has postpositions, not prepositions:

(16) a. *ív uimadsaguc-mia*⁸

they prayer-3PL-because.of

“because of their prayer” (Funeral Sermon and Prayer (1192-95))

b. [PP [DP *a ház ablaka*] *alatt*]

the house window-3SG below

“below the window of the house” (Modern Hungarian)

The ‘manner adverb–V’, ‘predicative nominal–copula’, ‘(telicizing) verbal particle–V’ orders, attested in Old and Modern Hungarian alike, are also generally regarded as typical of head-final languages.⁹

(17) a. *keseruen kynzathul*

bitterly torture-PASS-2SG

“you are being tortured bitterly” (Old Hungarian Mary’s Lament (1300))

b. *pur es chomuv uogmuc*

dust and ash be-1PL

“we are dust and ashes” (Funeral Sermon and Prayer (1192-95))

c. *turchucat mige zocoztia vola*

throat-3PL-ACC PRT rive-3SG be-PAST

“it was riving their throat” (Funeral Sermon and Prayer (1192-95))

⁸ *ív* (now spelled as *ő*), nondistinct from a singular 3rd person nominative pronoun, stands for *ők* ‘they’. In possessive constructions its *-k* plural suffix is always absent – see footnote 6.

⁹ These orders are reversed in the presence of a focus and/or negation, which elicit verb movement.

These head-final structures in themselves do not prove that Proto-Hungarian was SOV. The generalization that stable periods of languages are characterized by directional harmony has well-known exceptions (e.g. Persian), hence the existence of projections contradicting the basic directionality of a language does not necessarily mean that the language is in the process of changing from one harmonious stage to another. The head-final structures of Hungarian, nevertheless, provide supportive evidence; they confirm the SOV reconstructed for Proto-Hungarian on the basis of the comparison of Khanty, Mansi, and archaic Old-Hungarian constructions. Section 5 will show that some of these head-final structures are gradually being supplanted by head-initial variants, which further strengthens the assumption that they are slowly disappearing remnants of an SOV syntax.

Summarizing section 1: The claim that Proto-Hungarian was an SOV language is based on evidence of three kinds. The majority of present-day Uralic languages, among them the two sister languages of Hungarian, are SOV. Old Hungarian still displayed relics of a former SOV period. It had a strictly SOV non-finite clause type with a morphologically unmarked object (parallel to the pattern of finite clauses in Khanty and Mansi). The temporal auxiliary in Old Hungarian immediately followed the V, which must have grammaticalized in a period when the head-final VP was subsumed by a head-final TP. The interrogative particle had two alternative positions (V-adjacent and clause-final), which presumably derived from a complementizer position that was simultaneously both V-adjacent and clause-final in the SOV proto-language. Many typological features of Hungarian also appear to be remnants of a former head-final grammar.

3. The reanalysis of SOV as Top Foc V X*

In the SOV sentence structure that many Uralic languages seem to have preserved, the S and O constituents not only bear grammatical functions, but simultaneously also fulfil discourse roles: the subject also functions as the (primary) topic, and the object functions as the focus, or as a secondary topic. In Khanty and Mansi, the languages most closely related to Hungarian, the coincidence of the subject and topic roles is an absolute requirement; if the thematically most prominent complement is to be assigned the focus role, and some other complement is to act as the primary topic, the sentence must be passivized (Nikolaeva 1999). (In the Khanty passive construction, not only the D-structure object but also any adverbial complement can undergo NP-movement – cf. Kulonen (1989).) Observe the Khanty minimal pair in (18). The subject of (18a) is substituted in (18b) by an interrogative pronoun, which is

obligatorily focussed. Hence the sentence must be passivized, with the D-structure object raised into the position of the subject-topic:

(18) a. (*luw*) *juwan re:sk-ə-s*

he Ivan hit

“He hit Ivan.”

b. *juwan xoj-na re:sk-ə-s-a*

Ivan who-OBL hit-PASS-PAST-3SG

“Who hit Ivan?” (Nikolaeva 1999: 58)

If the object of the SOV clause is not a focus but a contextually given secondary topic, its topic role is marked by a nominal suffix in Mansi dialects, and by an agreement morpheme on the verb in Khanty dialects – see Marcantonio (1985: 285), Nikolaeva (1999, 2001), and Dalrymple and Nikolaeva (2011). In the (a) version of the Khanty example in (19), where the verb only agrees with the subject, the object is a focus, whereas in the (b) and (c) versions, where the V also agrees with the object, the object is a secondary topic; it is the verb that represents the new information. Notice that the object is definite in the (a) example as well, i.e., object–verb agreement is not elicited by its [+definite] feature.

(19) a. *ma tam kalaŋ we:l-s-ə-m*

I this reindeer kill-PAST-EP-1SG (EP=epenthetic vowel)

“I killed THIS REINDEER.”

b. *ma tam kalaŋ wel-s-0-e:m*

I this reindeer kill-PAST-SG-1SG

“I KILLED this reindeer.”

c. *ma tam kalaŋ we:l-s-ə-l-am*

I these reindeer kill-PAST-EP-PL-1SG

“I KILLED these reindeer.” (Nikolaeva 1999: 64)

The fusion of grammatical functions and discourse roles attested in Khanty and Mansi has also been hypothesized for the Proto-Hungarian period (or at least for a part of it) – cf.

Marcantonio (1985) and É. Kiss (2011b). The hypothesis is based on the same type of comparative evidence that was evoked in the reconstruction of Proto-Hungarian SOV: the type of differential object agreement that has been preserved in Khanty, encoding the topic versus focus function of the object, still occurs sporadically in Old Hungarian as well, which suggests that it is Proto-Ugric heritage surviving in the daughter languages.

By the Old Hungarian period, the general pattern of verbal agreement had already changed from that preserved in Khanty. In Old Hungarian – like in Modern Hungarian – object–verb agreement is elicited by definite objects (cf. Bartos 2000, É. Kiss 2000). Indefinite objects trigger the same indefinite verbal paradigm that is also used with intransitive verbs.¹⁰ However, as Bárczi (1958) demonstrates, Old Hungarian and early Middle Hungarian usage sometimes deviates from this pattern, and in the deviating cases, verb–object agreement occasionally appears to be determined by the topic versus focus role of the object. That is, we find sporadic topicalized indefinite objects, e.g., indefinite relative pronouns, with the verb in the definite conjugation (20a), and also sporadic non-topicalized definite objects with the verb in the indefinite conjugation (20b):

(20) a. *Saul keral kít isten meg vetí az engedetlensegert*¹¹
 Saul king-NOM whom God PRT despise-DEF.3SG the disobedience-for
 “King Saul, whom God despises for the disobedience”

(Guary C. (before 1495), p. 19, cited by Bárczi (1958, p. 148))

b. *Isten tamaszt erőš óltalmazoit az igassagnac*
 God raise-INDEF.3SG strong protectors-3SG-ACC the truth-DAT
 “God raises strong protectors of the truth”

(Bornemisza (1588), cited by Bárczi (1958, p. 148))

The assumption that Hungarian object–verb agreement originally served to mark the topic role of objects is also supported by crosslinguistic parallels. Givón (1976) argues on the basis of the analysis of various Bantu languages that definite object – verb agreement, in general,

¹⁰ A reviewer pointed out that the choice of conjugation is also partly lexically conditioned (the pronoun for *all/everything* as object is indefinite), and is connected with person (1st and 2nd person objects always trigger the indefinite conjugation). I argue elsewhere that the determiner *minden* ‘every’, and the pronouns *minden* ‘everything’, and *mindenki* ‘everybody’ are specific indefinites (É. Kiss 2000), and in the case of 1st and 2nd person pronoun objects agreement is blocked by the Inverse Agreement Constraint (É. Kiss 2005, 2011b). On the history of the Hungarian definite and indefinite conjugations, see Hajdú (1966), Mikola (1966), Honti (1995), Kulonen (1999), Havas (2004), Honti (2009), É. Kiss (2010) etc.

¹¹ Since a relative pronoun can be preceded by a topicalized constituent, and, in Old Hungarian, also by a subordinating complementizer, it is claimed to occupy a topic position (see Kenesei 1994).

derives from topical object – verb agreement, with the topicality requirement sometimes reinterpreted as a definiteness requirement. Dalrymple and Nikolaeva (2011) point out differential object–verb agreement signalling the topic role of the object in several languages from various language families, among them Siberian Uralic languages.

Proto-Hungarian presumably employed verbal agreement to encode discourse functions because it had no topic and focus movement, i.e., the preverbal in situ constituents of the SOV sentence expressed both grammatical and discourse functions, as is attested in present-day Khanty and Mansi. Unlike Khanty and Mansi, however, Proto-Hungarian evolved a property that had important consequences for the further course of events in the language: it developed a generalized accusative marker. (According to Marcantonio (1985), this suffix originally marked only topicalized objects in Proto-Hungarian. It was its extension to all direct objects that gave rise to the marking of object topicality by verbal agreement.) The generalized accusative marker licensed a more flexible word order, and, in the long run, the separation of grammatical functions and discourse roles.

As is well-known, in the present-day Hungarian sentence the preverbal positions only convey discourse functions; arguments with no special discourse roles follow the verb. The change from Proto-Hungarian Top/S Foc/O V to Top Foc V X* could, in principle, have taken place in two ways: (i) by V-movement to the left, and the establishment of preverbal functional positions, or (ii) by the spreading of right dislocation, and the reanalysis of postverbal constituents as arguments in situ. If Hungarian had taken route (i), i.e., if it had developed new functional projections in front of the original structure, then the original SO order, presumably obligatory in the proto-language, would have been preserved. However, there is no evidence for a fixed (or at least preferred) SO postverbal order either in Old Hungarian or in Modern Hungarian; the postverbal section of the Hungarian sentence has been free since the time of the first written documents. If, however, Hungarian took route (ii), we get an explanation for the freedom of postverbal order. The present-day VX* may be the grammaticalization, or fossilization, of the output of iterated right dislocation performed in an arbitrary order.

Right dislocation is a common construction in SOV languages; it also exists in present-day Khanty. Nikolaeva (1999) describes it as an afterthought construction: “Ostyak [Khanty] exhibits afterthought constructions where afterthought is represented by an element added after the completion of the sentence to clarify either another word or the content of the whole sentence. The afterthought element is extraposed after the verb, and is arguably clause-

external” (Nikolaeva 1999, p. 57). In the following example of Nikolaeva, the two postverbal arguments specify the implicit goal, and the pro subject, respectively:

- (21) *pa su:sm-ə-s joxəšxo:t-ə-l u:l-ə-m taxa pela itta maxim*
 again walk-EP-PAST-3SG back house-EP-3SG be-EP-PASTPART place to that Maxim
 “Again he walked back to the place where his house was, this Maxim.”

(Nikolaeva 1999: 57)

In Proto-Hungarian, the appearance of a general accusative marker, i.e., the morphological distinction of the subject and object must have facilitated the use of right dislocation. I assume that when the proportion of right dislocated elements achieved a certain threshold, new generations of speakers analyzed them as base-generated, and interpreted the preverbal constituents as preposed into left-peripheral functional positions associated with discourse functions. That is, for these new generations of speakers, the fusion of discourse roles and grammatical functions, typical of many Uralic languages, ceased to exist; the verb divided the sentence into separate discourse-functional and thematic domains. The clause-initial subject/topic position was reanalyzed as a topic slot, and the preverbal object/focus position was reanalyzed as a focus slot.¹² The postverbal arguments of Proto-Hungarian, representing right-dislocated elements, came to be reanalyzed as arguments in situ. That is:

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| (22) <u>Proto-Hungarian</u> | → | <u>Old Hungarian</u> |
| subject/topic | → | topic |
| object/focus | → | focus |
| right-dislocated elements | → | in situ arguments |
| ↓↓↓ | | ↓↓↓ |
| SOV | → | topic focus V X* |

The hypothesis that the postverbal domain of the Old Hungarian sentence originated via the reanalysis of right dislocated arguments as arguments in situ is supported by various

¹² In fact, the object/focus may have two descendants in Modern Hungarian: a referential preverbal element is interpreted as an exhaustive focus, whereas a non-referential preverbal element, e.g., a bare nominal object, acts as a so-called verb-modifier, semantically incorporated into the verb. It is debated whether the focus and the verb-modifier occupy the same Spec,FocP slot, with their interpretational differences deriving from their different referential properties (É. Kiss 2006b), or they occupy two different positions (Brody 1990, É. Kiss 2008). If they do, i.e., if the verb modifier is located in Spec,PredP, or Spec,TP, then the immediately preverbal position of the focus in Spec,FocP is due to V-movement across the verb-modifier.

considerations. (i) As mentioned above, the free postverbal argument order of Old and Modern Hungarian can be explained if the Hungarian VP is the grammaticalization of the output of iterated right dislocation.

(ii) This hypothesis also explains another strange property of Hungarian, the prohibition against predicative nominals, including arguments represented by bare nominals, in the postverbal domain (cf. Alberti 1997).¹³ A non-specific complement, e.g., an object represented by a bare noun, or a secondary predicate, must occupy the immediately preverbal position – unless a focus or the negative particle elicits verb movement across it:

- (23) a. *Földet ért a repülőgép.*
 ground-ACC touch-PAST.SG the airplane
 “The airplane touched ground.”
- b. **Ért földet a repülőgép.*
- c. *ÖTKOR ért_i földet t_i a repülőgép.*
 five-at touch-PAST.SG ground-ACC the airplane
 “It was at five that the airplane touched ground.”

- (24) a. *Vendégek érkeztek.*
 guest- PL arrive-PAST-3PL
 “Guests arrived.”
- b. %*Érkeztek vendégek.*
- c. *Nem érkeztek_i vendégek t_i.*
 not arrive-PAST-3PL guest- PL
 “No guests arrived.”

(24b) is ungrammatical as a neutral sentence, but it can be acceptable as a verum focus, meaning ‘Guests DID arrive’. The verb is presumably preposed into a functional head across the bare nominal in such cases as well, similarly to the (c) examples. The prohibition against predicative nominals in the postverbal domain must have grammaticalized/fossilized when postverbal elements were still derived from an SOV structure by right dislocation. Recall that

¹³ Bare nominal arguments are, in fact, interpreted as predicates predicated about an implicit internal argument:

(i) *János egész délután levelet írt.*
 John whole afternoon letter-ACC write-PAST.3SG
 ‘John was letter-writing the whole afternoon. [John was writing the whole afternoon; what he was writing is of the type ‘letter’.]’

right-dislocated arguments in Khanty express “afterthoughts”, i.e., they typically serve to explicate implicit arguments with known referents, hence their referentiality/specificity is predicted.

(iii) The reanalysis of right-dislocated arguments as arguments in situ, resulting in a change from SOV to SVO, has also been attested – or at least hypothesized – in the case of other languages (cf. Lightfoot 1979: 385). Hyman (1975), for example, invokes it to explain word order differences between related languages of the Niger-Kongo family. He claims that in Kru, the “afterthought” origin of postverbal elements is still manifest in the intonational break before them.¹⁴ Polo (2005) raises the possibility that rightward extraposition played a role in the change from Latin SOV to Neo-Latin SVO. She demonstrates that in *Cena Trimalchionis* by Petronius about 25% of transitive clauses contain a right dislocated object or subject, and 16% of oblique complements also stand postverbally. Right dislocated elements mostly have the same discourse functions as left dislocated constituents: 90% of them are either familiarity topics, or contrastive foci, but the remaining, pragmatically unmarked 10% may already “relate to an innovating grammar VO”, where postverbal arguments are generated in situ.

4. Evidence for Old Hungarian Top Foc V X*

The hypothetical change described in section 2 must have taken place towards the end of the Proto-Hungarian period, perhaps after the settlement of Hungarian tribes in the Carpathian Basin in 896.¹⁵ It may have been facilitated by the presumably SVO language of the Slav population that Hungarians found here. The first surviving coherent Old Hungarian document, the Funeral Sermon and Prayer, an 1192-95 copy of a possibly earlier text, is already clearly Top Foc V X*, displaying the same sentence structure that is also attested in Modern Hungarian – except that it employs topicalization and focusing much less frequently than modern Hungarian does.

In the 50 clauses of Funeral Sermon and Prayer, only 11 clauses have an overt subject. The subject appears postverbally in three sentences, e.g.:

¹⁴ In Hungarian, no obligatory pause before postverbal arguments has grammaticalized. The preverbal focus and the verb form a single prosodic word. The ‘focus plus verb’ complex can be followed by a pause, i.e., a prosodic phrase boundary, if it is followed by stressed constituents conveying contextually new information. Observe the prosodic phrasing of the following example:

(i) (*KI ment el?*) [*JÁNOS ment el az*] [*ISKOLÁBA*].
who left PRT John left PRT the school-to
“Who left?” “JOHN left for SCHOOL.”

¹⁵ Recall that the three centuries between 896 and the time of the first surviving Hungarian document are part of the Old Hungarian period for Hungarian linguistic tradition, but since its language is undocumented except for fragments, mainly proper names in Latin and Greek documents, I regard it as Proto-Hungarian.

(25) *Horoguvec isten*
 raged God
 “God was raging.”

The claim that the base position of the subject is in the postverbal domain is most clearly supported by the clause cited in (26), where the possessor of the subject is separated from the possessum; the possessor is clause-initial, and the possessum is postverbal. The possessor functions as an aboutness topic, but the possessum has no special discourse role. Therefore, the movement of the possessor from a postverbal position can be analyzed as topicalization; the postposing of the possessum from a preverbal position, on the other hand, would be an ad hoc move with no reason.

(26) *Es [oz gimilsnek]_i vvl keseruv uola t_i vize*
 and the fruit-DAT so bitter was juice-3SG
 “and of the fruit, so bitter was the juice”

The preverbal subjects have all been A-bar moved. They are either aboutness topics, or foci. In (27), *isten* ‘God’ functions as an aboutness topic, preposing a referent given in the comment of the previous clause:

(27) *Es vimagguc mend szentucut. hug legenec neki seged uromc scine elevt.*
 and adore-IMP-1PL all saints-ACC that be-IMP-3PL him aide lord-1PL-GEN in-front-of
hug [_{TopP} ***isten*** [_{TopP} *iv uimadsagucmia* [*bulsassa w bunet*]]]
 that god their prayer-3PL-because.of forgive-SUBJUNC.3SG he sin-3SG-ACC
 “And let us adore all saints that they be his aide in front of our Lord. That **God** should forgive his sin because of their prayer”

The interrogative wh-phrase in (28a) and the pronoun answering it in (28b) are foci. The focus role of the pronominal subject in (28b) is indicated, among others, by the lack of pro-drop.

(28) a. [_{FocP} ***ki*** [*ozvc*]] b. [_{FocP} ***miv*** [*vogmuc*]]
 who those we are

“Who are those?” “It is us.”

The preverbal, post-topic focus position of *wh*-arguments is a property of Hungarian preserved from the Ugric proto-language (cf. the discussion of (18b)) till the present. The fact that the *wh*-phrase in Old Hungarian is not in Spec,CP but occupies the post-topic Spec,FocP slot is clear from examples like (29), which also contain a topic:

- (29) [_{TopP} *En kèdig* [_{FocP} *mit* [*sègelhètèc* *tùtøket*]]]
I on.the.other.hand what-ACC help-POSSIB-1SG you-PL-ACC
“What can I help you?” (Vienna C., Baruch 4,17)

The negative indefinite cited from the Funeral Sermon and Prayer in (30) may occupy the specifier of a NegP in the left periphery:

- (30) *isa es num igg ember mulchotia ez vermut*
surely even not one man miss-POSSIB-3SG this pit-ACC
“Surely, not even one man can miss this pit”

Of the 50 clauses of the Funeral Sermon and Prayer, 20 contain an object. The object appears postverbally in 14 cases. Preverbal objects include relative pronouns (31), and topicalized lexical objects (32).

- (31) *kit vr ez nopun ez homus vilag timnucebelevl mente*
whom God this day this treacherous world prison-3SG-from save-PAST-3SG
“Whom God saved from the prison of this treacherous world this day”

- (32) *hug turchucat mige zocoztia vola*
that throat-3PL-ACC PRT rive-3SG be-PAST
“that it was riving their throat”

The immediately preverbal object in (33) could either be focus or topic:

- (33) *kinec ez nopun testet tumetive*
who-DAT this day body-3SG-ACC bury-1PL

“of whom we bury the body this day”

Like in Modern Hungarian, the left edge of the comment provided a landing site for overt quantifier raising as well. (34), where the quantifier adjoined to the left edge of the matrix VP is a complement of the embedded infinitive, is a particularly clear case of overt quantifier movement:

- (34) *Es [mend paradisumben uolov gimilcictul]_i munda neki elnie t_i*
and all Paradise-in being fruits-from tell-PAST-3SG he.DAT live-INF.3SG
“and he told him to live on all fruits in Paradise”

These facts indicate that the Hungarian clause at the end of the 12th century was structured in the same way as the Modern Hungarian sentence: the V-initial thematic domain was preceded by a left periphery involving a NegP, a FocP, an iterable TopP, and a CP. The left edge of the comment provided a landing site for overt quantifier raising as well. At the same time, the preverbal functional projections were occupied much less frequently than in Modern Hungarian; half of the 50 clauses are V-initial. (By way of comparison, I examined the clausal left periphery in current funeral sermons (<http://reftokaj.fw.hu/predikaciok.html>; <http://home.claranet.de/koinonia/52koin05.htm>). I have found that in present-day funeral sermons of comparable length, the average number of V-initial clauses is 3.)

In the postverbal domain of the Old Hungarian sentence, arguments and adjuncts were lined up in a free order, e.g., pronouns, preceding heavy ones, for example:

- (35) a. *Horogvec isten es veteve wt ez muncas vilagbele.*
raged God and throw-PAST-3SG him this laborious world-into
“God raged, and threw him into this laborious world.”
- b. *es odu-tt-a vol-a neki paradisumut hazoa*
and gave-PERF-3SG be-PAST he.DAT Paradise-ACC house-for
“and had given him Paradise for a house”

These facts suggest that the postverbal section of the sentence was linearized in the phonological component of the derivation (and this property of Hungarian, too, has remained unchanged in the past 800 years).

In sum: the change from SOV to Top Foc V X* sentence structure must have taken place before the end of the 12th century, the time since when Hungarian syntax has been documented in coherent written texts. The first surviving Hungarian text from the late 12th century displays the same basic structure as Modern Hungarian. The verb divides the sentence into a functional and a thematic domain. The functional domain begins with a complementizer position, and it provides landing sites for iterated topicalization, for overt quantifier raising, and for focus movement. It also contains a NegP. The order of postverbal arguments is free except that light, unstressed constituents tend to precede heavier ones.

5. The slow restructuring of grammar from head-final to head-initial

According to the evidence presented in Section 3, the basic SOV structure of Proto-Hungarian, inherited from Proto-Ugric and Proto-Uralic, had changed before the documented history of Hungarian to a head-initial VP, subsumed by head-initial functional projections, with their specifiers providing landing sites for left-peripheral topics and foci. This change apparently initiated the restructuring of other parts of Hungarian grammar as well. The drift from head-final to head-initial is a still ongoing process. It is evident in the disappearance of SOV properties, and in the evolution of constructions typical of head-initial languages.

5.1. The disappearance of the SOV relics of Old Hungarian

The SOV relics of Old Hungarian discussed in Section 1.2, preserving Proto-Hungarian and even Proto-Ugric constructions, had either disappeared by the Middle Hungarian period, or had lost their flexibility and productivity, and had turned into linguistic fossils.

The SOV participial clause with a morphologically unmarked object had become obsolete by 1500.

The obligatory V–Aux order disappeared with the obsolescence of complex tenses in the Middle Hungarian period. The *-t* perfectivity morpheme on the verb came to be reinterpreted as a general marker of all tenses referring to a time preceding the speech time, which made the auxiliary bearing the past tense morpheme superfluous (cf. É. Kiss 2006a). Actually, the temporal auxiliary has survived in the so-called past conditional (in fact: perfect conditional) paradigm, which has also preserved the obligatory ‘V Aux’ order. Although the auxiliary is identical with the copula supplied with the conditional morpheme, the V+auxiliary string is a fossilized complex head for present-day intuition; its two elements are inseparable also in constructions involving V-movement:

- (36) a. *Össze tépte volna az iratot.*
 up tear-PAST-3SG be-COND the document-ACC
 “He would have torn up the document.”
- cf. b. [*Tépte volna*]_i *össze t_i az iratot!*
 “Had he only torn up the document!”
- c. **Tépte össze volna az iratot!*

The temporal, aspectual and modal verbs which have remained in use all precede their infinitival complement in the unmarked case – as illustrated by the Old Hungarian example in (37) below. Whether they are to be analyzed as auxiliaries or lexical verbs, they clearly project a head-initial phrase.¹⁶

- (37) *hogy ehsegtewl sok emberek fognak meg halny*
 that hunger-from many persons will-3PL PRT die
 “that many people will die from hunger” (Jókai C., p. 63)

The V–Aux order illustrated in (38), representing a less common option, has been claimed to be a derived order, which serves to prevent the auxiliary from bearing the main stress assigned to the left edge of the comment (Szendrői 2003).

- (38) [_{TopP} *János* [_{TP} *énekelni_i fog [...t_i]]]*
 John sing-INF will-3SG
 “John will sing.”

The clause-final position of the interrogative particle ceased to be used in the Old Hungarian period. In standard Modern Hungarian, the interrogative particle of *yes-no* questions, obligatory in embedded clauses, optional in matrix questions, cliticizes to the verb. Assuming that the verb occupies a pre-VP T head, the interrogative particle has been relocated from the right edge of the clause to the left periphery. In some dialects, its position is even farther to the left; it cliticizes to the leftmost phonological word of the comment, the carrier of main stress (which can be the verb in T, the specifier of TP, the negative particle, or the focus). Compare:

¹⁶ Kenesei (2000) identifies three auxiliaries among them; he analyzes the rest as lexical verbs.

- (39) a. *Nem-e Illés vagy te?* (dialectal)
 not-Q Elias be-2SG you
 “Aren’t you Elias?”
- b. *Nem Illés vagy-e te?* (standard)

The prenominal participial relative, still productive in Old Hungarian, has mostly lost its flexibility and productivity; it has been replaced by postnominal finite relative clauses. The remaining participial relative construction has practically been fossilized; it can be used only with a subset of transitive verbs and only with a 3rd person lexical subject. Of examples (40a-c), which all would have been grammatical in Old Hungarian (cf. example (15)), only (40a) is possible in Modern Hungarian:

- (40) a. *az anyám sütötte kenyér*
 the mother-1SG bake-PASTPART-3SG bread
 “the bread which my mother baked”

but: b. **az én sütöttem kenyér*
 the I bake-PASTPART-1SG bread
 “the bread which I baked”

- c. * *az anyám szerette kenyér*
 the mother-1SG like-PASTPART-3SG bread
 “the bread which my mother liked”

5.2. A left-peripheral NegP supplanting V-adjoined negation

A change in the distribution of the negative constructions also shows the gradual spreading of head-initial grammar. In Old-Hungarian texts we attest two negative constructions: a declining pattern, and an innovative construction, which is gradually supplanting the former alternative. The archaic pattern, which represents the majority in Old-Hungarian documents but later loses ground to the innovative variant, contains the negative particle between the verbal particle and the verb, presumably adjoined to the verb, as is also attested in present-day Khanty and Mansi:

- (41) *hogy zent atyának frater Rufinus meg-nem mondottauala*
 that holy father-3SG-DAT frater Rufinus PRT-not say-PERF-3SG-be-PAST
 “that frater Rufinus had not said it to his holy father” (Jókai C. (1370/1448) p. 51)

In the innovative pattern of negation, the negative particle+verb complex is to be found in the left periphery. The verb precedes not only the verbal particle but also the VP adjuncts – see (42), which suggests verb movement to a left-peripheral Neg position:

- (42) [_{NegP} [*nem fizettel*]_i [_{VP} *telyesseguel* [_{VP} *meg t_i*]]]
 not paid completely up
 “...you have not paid up completely” (Jókai C. (1370/1448) p. 7)

The S-curve of the change from the ‘verbal prt–negative prt–V’ order illustrated in (41) to the ‘negative prt–V–(X)–verbal prt’ order illustrated in (42) still has not completely straightened; the old pattern survives in Modern Hungarian *until* and *unless* clauses, and can optionally be used in *if* clauses and imperatives as well:

- (43) *Vártam, amíg meg nem érkezett.*
 waited-I until PRT not arrive-PAST.3SG
 “I was waiting until he arrived.”

5.3. Finite clauses replacing non-finite subordinate clauses

In the course of the Old and Middle Hungarian periods, we attest the slow disappearance of various non-finite clause types, and their replacement with finite subordinate clauses. The productive equivalent of the prenominal participial relative illustrated in (40a) is a postnominal finite relative clause introduced by a relative pronoun. These are the grammatical equivalents of the obsolete (40b) and (40c) constructions in Modern Hungarian:

- (44) a. *az a kenyér, melyet én sütöttem*
 that the bread which I bake-PAST-1SG
 “that bread which I baked”
 b. *az a kenyér, melyet anyám szeretett*
 that the bread which mother-1SG like-PAST.3SG

“that bread which my mother liked”

Adverbial participial clauses have also been mostly replaced by finite clauses introduced by a relative pronominal expression or a complementizer, as illustrated by subsequent translations of one and the same sentences of the Bible.

St John 1,29:

(45) a. *Masod napō kedig lata Janos Jezust o hozia iqvette*
second day COORD see-PAST.3SG John Jesus-ACC he to come-ADVPART
“On the second day, John saw Jesus coming to him” (Munich C. (1416/1466))

b. *Masod napon lata Janos Iesust hogy ew hozza iewne*
second day see-PAST.3SG John Jesus-ACC that he to come-SUBJ.3SG
“On the second day, John saw Jesus as he was coming to him”
(Gábor Pesthi, Novum Testamentum (1536))

St Matthew 13,6:

(46) a. *Nap kedig felkèluē meg hèuϕlènc*
sun COORD rising PRT burned-PAST-3SG
“The sun having risen, they burned.” (Munich C. (1416/1466))

b. *mykoron az nap fel tamadot wolna, meg swte ewket*
when the sun up rise-PERF-3SG be-PAST PRT burn-PAST.3SG them
“When the sun had risen, it burned them.”
(Gábor Pesthi, Novum Testamentum (1536))

The adverbial participle heading the embedded clause in (45a) had become completely obsolete by the Middle Hungarian period. The *-ván/vén* participle in (46a) has lost its flexibility and productivity; it is only used with a controlled PRO subject in Modern Hungarian, and it has an archaic flavor.

As shown by Tóth (2010), infinitival object clauses have also lost ground to finite *that* clauses since the Old Hungarian period. The set of subject control verbs has become smaller; many verbs allowing an infinitival complement in Old Hungarian can only be used with a finite complement clause in Modern Hungarian. Compare a sentence of the 1416 Bible

translation with its modern equivalents, first the corresponding sentence of the 1997 edition of the Bible (47b), then its literal modern translation (47c).

Judith 5,26:

(47) a. *gondollakuala ojet megojniec*

think-3PL-be-PAST him PRT-kill-INF-3PL

“they thought to kill him” (Vienna C. (1416/1450))

b. *azt mondták, hogy darabokra tépik.*

it-ACC say-PAST-3PL that pieces-into tear-DEF.3PL

“they said that they would tear him into pieces” (Káldi-Neovulgata (1997))

c. *Azt gondolták, hogy megölik.*

it-ACC think-PAST-3PL that PRT-kill-DEF.3PL

“They thought that they would kill him.”

Object control has almost disappeared; in Modern Hungarian it is only allowed by the verbs ended ‘let’, *lát* ‘see’ and *hall* ‘hear’. Compare the 15th and 16th century translations St Matthew 14,22:

(48) a. *Kènzèreite i^c [Jèzus] o, taneituanit a aioc’kaba felmènnièc*

force-PAST.3SG Jesus he disciples-3SG-ACC the boat-into up-go-INF-3PL

“Jesus forced his disciples to go up into the boat” (Munich C. (1416/1466))

b. *Ees mynd iarast meg hagyta Iesus az ew tanytwanyanak, hogy*

and at.once PRT say-PAST.3SG Jesus the he disciples-3SG-DAT that

hayora zallananak

boat-on get-SUBJUNC-3PL

“and Jesus told his disciples at once that they should get on the boat”

(Gábor Pesthi, Novum Testamentum (1536))

The use of infinitival purpose clauses has also become more constrained. Compare subsequent translations of St Mark 5,14:

(49) a. *Ki menenec kedig latnioc*
 out go-PAST-3PL COORD see-INF-3PL
 “they went out to see” (Munich C. (1416/1466))

b. *honnet ky iewenek hogy meg latnak a my*
 where-from out come-PAST-3PL that PRT see-SUBJUNC-3PL what
tewrtynt wala.
 happen-PERF.3SG be-PAST
 “from where they came out so that they could see what had happened”
 (Gábor Pesthi, *Novum Testamentum* (1536))

If we compare map 81 with maps 94 and 96 of the *World Atlas of Language Structures* (Haspelmath et al. 2005), we find a strong correlation between SOV structure and the preponderance of non-finite adverbial and relative clauses, and SVO structure and the preponderance of finite adverbial and relative clauses. Hawkins’s (2001) performance theory of word order provides an explanation for this correlation. The basic notion of Hawkins’s theory is ‘Constituent Recognition Domain’. The Constituent Recognition Domain for a phrasal mother node consists of the set of nodes that are minimally needed to recognize the category of the mother node, and to identify its major constituents. Hawkins claims that the human parser prefers linear orders that minimize the Constituent Recognition Domain. The shortest domain for the recognition of a matrix VP containing a clausal argument or adjunct must contain the matrix verb and the subordinator of the embedded clause – as close to each other as possible. In an SOV sentence, this domain is shortest if the subordinator is a participial suffix on the embedded verb, left-adjacent to the matrix verb. In an SVO sentence, on the other hand, this domain is shortest if the subordinator is a complementizer at the left edge of the embedded clause, right-adjacent to the main verb.

5.4. Postpositions reinterpreted as bound morphemes

In early Old Hungarian, practically all local relations were expressed by head-final PPs. By the Middle Hungarian period, about a dozen of those postpositions have become bound morphemes, i.e., the PPs have turned into adverbial KasePs. Bound morphemes, however, fall within the scope of the Mirror Principle, that is, the ‘complement – bound morpheme’ order is the morphological mapping of a syntactic ‘head – complement’ order. Compare some local

adverbial PPs from an 1055 Hungarian fragment and from the *Funeral Sermon and Prayer* with their present-day equivalents:

(50) a. *feheruaru rea meneh hodo utu rea* (Tihany Foundation Charter (1055))

Fehérvár-onto going military road-onto

Fehérvár-ra menő hadi út-ra (Modern Hungarian)

Fehérvár-SUBLATIVE going military road-SUBLATIVE

“onto the road going onto Fehérvár”

b. *ez muncas vilag-bele* (Funeral Sermon and Prayer (1192-95))

this laborious world into

e munkás világ-ba (Modern Hungarian)

this laborious world-ILLATIVE

“into this laborious world”

c. *ez homus vilag timnuce-belevl* (Funeral Sermon and Prayer (1192-95))

this treacherous world prison-3SG-from

e hamis világ tömlöcé-ből (Modern Hungarian)

this treacherous world prison-3SG- ELATIVE

“from the prison of this treacherous world”

d. *ez scegin ember lilki ert* (Funeral Sermon and Prayer (1192-95))

this poor man soul-3SG for

e szegény ember lelké-ért (Modern Hungarian)

this poor man soul-3SG-CAUSALIS/FINALIS

“for the soul of this poor man”

Although *bele*, *belevl* and their nominal complements are spelled as one word in (50b) and (50c), their postposition status is shown by the fact that – unlike case endings – they are two-syllable long, and they still have not developed their back-vowel allomorphs required by Hungarian vowel harmony. These postpositions derived from the noun *bél* ‘internal part’ supplied with different archaic case suffixes, and their internal structure could still be recognizable around 1200.

In sum: As was argued in section 3, the basic change from SOV to Top Foc V X* must have taken place in Hungarian before the end of the 12th century, the beginning of the documented history of the language. This change appears to have initiated the restructuring of other parts of grammar as well, from head-final to head-initial. The V–auxiliary order indicative of a head-final TP was replaced by the auxiliary–V order. The head-final position of the interrogative complementizer disappeared. The interrogative complementizer, obligatory in embedded *yes-no* questions, has survived as an interrogative particle attached to the V preposed into T in the left periphery. The negative particle, originally acting as a negative modifier attached to the V, has assumed an operator position in the left periphery. Prenominal participial relatives have been replaced by postnominal relative clauses. Non-finite clauses, in general, have lost ground to finite embedded sentences. Interestingly, some of the obsolescent head-final constructions have only lost their flexibility and productivity, and still survive as linguistic fossils. Many postpositions have turned into morphological case endings, which resulted in the reanalysis of head-final PPs as head-initial syntactic structures subjected to the Mirror Principle.

6. Conclusion

The paper has argued on the basis of evidence of various kinds that Hungarian underwent a word order change from SOV to Top Foc V X* prior to its documented history beginning at the end of the 12th century. It has been argued that the most likely scenario of this change was the spreading of right dislocation, and the reanalysis of right dislocated elements by new generations of speakers as arguments in situ. In Hungarian – as opposed to Khanty and Mansi, its sister languages – right dislocation was facilitated by the extension of differential object marking to all direct objects, i.e., the systematic morphological encoding of grammatical functions. In the Uralic family, only some of the European branches, surrounded by Indo-European languages for more than a millenium, have changed from head-final to head-initial. This raises the possibility that their change was supported by areal pressure.

References

- Alberti, Gábor. 1997. “Restrictions on the degree of referentiality of arguments in Hungarian sentences”. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 44: 3-4.341-362.
- Bartos, Huba. 2000. “Az inflexió jelenségek szintaktikai háttere” [The syntactic background of inflection phenomena]. *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan II. Morfológia* [Structural

- Hungarian grammar II. Morphology] ed. by Ferenc Kiefer, 653-761. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Bárczi, Géza. 1958. "A tárgyias igeragozás használatának történetéből" [On the history of the use of objective conjugation]. *Magyar Nyelv* 54.257-270.
- Brody, Michael. 1990. "Some remarks on the focus field in Hungarian". *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 2.201-226. University College London
- Campbell, Lyle & Alice C. Harris. 2002. "Syntactic reconstruction and demythologizing 'Myths and the prehistory of grammars'". *Journal of Linguistics* 38.599-618.
- Collinder, Björn. 1960. *Comparative Grammar of the Uralic Languages*. Stockholm: Almqvist.
- Dalrymple, Mary & Irina Nikolaeva. 2011. *Objects and Information Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Egedi, Barbara. 2011. "Az ómagyar határozott névelő kialakulásának grammatikai vonatkozásai" [Grammatical aspects of the evolution of the Old Hungarian definite article]. *A nyelvtörténeti kutatások újabb eredményei VI* [Recent results of diachronic research VI] ed. by Marianne Bakró-Nagy & Tamás Forgács, 35-48. Szeged: Szegedi Tudományegyetem BTK.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 1994. "Sentence structure and word order". *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian, Syntax and Semantics vol. 27*. ed. by Ferenc Kiefer & Katalin É. Kiss, 1-90. San Diego-New York: Academic Press.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2000. "The Hungarian NP is like the English NP". *Approaches to Hungarian VII*. ed. by Gábor Alberti & István Kenesei, 119-150. Szeged: JATE.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2005. "The inverse agreement constraint in Hungarian - a relic of a Uralic-Siberian Sprachbund?" *Organizing Grammar. Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk* ed. by Hans Broekhuis et al., 108-116. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2006a. "From the grammaticalization of viewpoint aspect to the grammaticalization of situation aspect". *Event structure and the left periphery* ed. by Katalin É. Kiss, 129-158. Dordrecht: Springer.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2008. "Free word order, (non-)configurationality and phases". *Linguistic Inquiry* 39: 3.441-474.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2010. "A magyar tárgyias és alanyi igeragozás kialakulásának szintaktikai hátteréről" [On the syntactic background of the evolution of the Hungarian objective and subjective conjugations]. To appear in *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*.

- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2011a. “A negative cycle in 12-15th century Hungarian?” To appear in *Syntax over Time: Lexical, Morphological and Information-Structural Interactions* ed. by Teresa Biberauer & George Walkden. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2011b. “Differential object–verb agreement is (fossilized) topic–verb agreement”. Ms. Budapest: Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- Ferraresi, Gisella & Maria Goldbach, eds. 2008. *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, Talmy. 1976. “Topic, pronoun, and grammatical agreement”. *Subject and Topic* ed. by Charles Li & Sandra Thompson, 149-188. New York: Academic Press.
- Gugán, Katalin. 2012. “Zigzagging in language history: Negation and negative concord in Hungarian“. To appear in *FULL [Finno-Ugric Languages and Linguistics]* 1: 1.
- Gulya, János. 1970. “Aktiv, Ergativ und Passiv im Vach-Ostjakischen”. *Symposium über Syntax der uralischen Sprachen* ed. by Wolfgang Schlachter. Göttingen: Van den Hoock and Ruprecht.
- Hajdú, Péter. 1966. *Bevezetés az uráli nyelvtudományba* [Introduction to Uralic linguistics]. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó.
- Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil, & Bernard Comrie, eds. 2005. *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Havas, Ferenc. 2004. “Objective Conjugation and Medialisation”. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 51: 1-2.95–141.
- Hawkins, John A. 2001. “Some issues in a performance theory of word order”. *Constituent order in the Languages of Europe* ed. by Anna Siewierska, 729-782. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Honti, László. 1995. “Zur Morphotaktik und Morphosyntax der uralischen/finnisch-ugrischen Grundsprache”. *Congressus Octavus Internationalis Fennougristarum* ed. by Heikki Leskinen, Pars I. 53-82. Jyväskylä: Moderatores.
- Honti, László. 2009. “Tűnődések tárgyaz igeragozásunk kialakulásáról” [Thoughts about the origin of our objective conjugation]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 106.132-146.
- Hyman, Larry. 1975. “On the change from SOV to SVO: evidence from Niger Congo”. *Word Order and Word Order Change* ed. by Charles Li, 113-144. Austin: University of Texas.
- Juhász, Dezső. 1991. “A módosítószók” [Particles]. *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana* [Historical grammar of Hungarian] I. ed. by Loránd Benkő, 501-513. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

- Kenesei, István. 1994. "Subordinate clauses". *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian. Syntax and Semantics 27*. ed. by Ferenc Kiefer & Katalin É. Kiss, 275-353. San Diego – New York: Academic Press.
- Kenesei, István. 2000. "Van-e segédige a magyarban?" [Are there auxiliaries in Hungarian?] *Igei vonzatszerkezet a magyarban* [Verbal complement structure in Hungarian] ed. by István Kenesei, 157-196. Budapest: Osiris.
- Kulonen, Ulla-Maija. 1989. *The Passive in Ob-Ugrian*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Kulonen, Ulla-Maija. 1999. "Object marking in the Ugric languages". *Az Ugor Műhely (Budapest, 1997 szeptember 17-19) előadásai* [Lectures of the Ugric Workshop (Sept. 17-19, 1997)], 63-71. Budapest: Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- Lightfoot, David. 1979. *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lightfoot, David. 2002. "Myths and the prehistory of grammars". *Journal of Linguistics* 38.113-136.
- Marcantonio, Angela. 1985. "On the definite vs. indefinite conjugation in Hungarian: A typological and diachronic analysis". *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 35.267-298.
- Mengden, Ferdinand van. 2008. "Reconstructing complex structures". *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction* ed. by Gisella Ferraresi & Maria Goldbach, 97-120. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mikola, Tibor. 1966. "A tárgyrag és a tárgyas ragozás kérdéséhez" [On the issue of the accusative suffix and the objective conjugation]. *Magyar Nyelv* 62.441-461.
- Nikolaeva, Irina. 1999. *Ostyak*. Languages of the World/Materials 305. München: LINCOM Europa.
- Nikolaeva, Irina. 2001. "Secondary topic as a relation in information structure". *Linguistics* 39.1-49.
- Pápay, József. 1906–8. "Északi-osztják nyelvtanulmányok" [Northern Ostyak linguistic studies]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 36.345–98; 37.52–79; 164–95; 258–75; 38.111–50; 313–29.
- Pires, Acrisio & Sarah G. Thomason. 2008. "How much syntactic reconstruction is possible?" *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction* ed. by Gisella Ferraresi & Maria Goldbach, 27-72. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Polo, Chiara. 2005. "Latin word order in generative perspective: An explanatory proposal within the sentence domain". *Universal Grammar in the Reconstruction of Ancient Languages* ed. by Katalin É. Kiss, 373-428. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rédei, Károly. 1978. *Syrjänische Chrestomathie mit Grammatik und Glossar*. Studia Uralica 1. Wien: Verband der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften Österreichs.
- Saarinen, Sirkka. 1991. "Typological differences between the Volgaic languages". *SKY* 1991, 43-52.
- Simonyi, Zsigmond. 1882. *A magyar kötőszók* [Hungarian coordinators and subordinators] II. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Szendrői, Kriszta. 2003. "A stress-based approach to the syntax of Hungarian focus". *The Linguistic Review* 20.37-78.
- Tóth, Ildikó. 2010. "A ragozott főnévi igenevek a kései ómagyar korban" [Inflected infinitives in the late Old Hungarian period]. Ms, Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. <http://www.nytud.hu/oszt/elmnyelv/mgtsz/05tothcikk.pdf>
- Vilkuna, Maria. 1998. "Word order in European Uralic". *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe* ed. by Anna Siewierska, 173-234. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sources of examples:

- A Tihanyi Apátság alapítólevele [The foundation charter of the Tihany Monastery]. 1055. *Magyar nyelvemlékek* [Old Hungarian linguistic documents] ed. by József Molnár & Györgyi Simon, 17. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1977.
- Halotti beszéd és könyörgés [Funeral Sermon and Prayer]. 1192-95. *Magyar nyelvemlékek* [Old Hungarian linguistic documents] ed. by József Molnár & Györgyi Simon, 27. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1977.
- Ómagyar Mária-siralom [Old Hungarian Mary's Lament]. 1300. *Magyar nyelvemlékek* [Old Hungarian linguistic documents] ed. by József Molnár & Györgyi Simon, 44. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó, 1977.
- Jókai-kódex*. 1370/1448. ed. by János P. Balázs. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1981.
- Bécsi codex* [Vienna Codex]. 1416-1435/1450. ed. by Gedeon Mészöly. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1916.
- Guary-kódex*. Before 1495. ed. by Lajos Katona. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, 1908.
- Jordánszky-kódex*. 1516-1519. ed. by György Volf. Buda, 1888.

Kazinczy-kódex. 1526-1541. ed. by Zsuzsa Kovács. Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, 2003.

Müncheni kódex [Munich Codex]. 1416-35/1466. ed. by Antal Nyíri. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971.

Nádor-kódex. 1508. ed. by István Pusztai. Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, 1994.

Bornemisza, Péter. 1588. Tragoedia magyar nyelven, az Sophocles Electrájából [Tragedy in Hungarian, based on Sophocles's Electra]. In: *Humanisták és prédikátorok* [Humanists and preachers]. Szentendre: Interpopulart, 1993.

Szentírás [Holy Scripture] (*Káldi-Neovulgáta*). Budapest: Szent Jeromos Katolikus Bibliatársulat, 1997.