

-atta/ette participles in Old Hungarian

Dékány Éva

Revised MGTSZ project meeting handout

April 2012

1. Introduction

The Old Hungarian participial form *-atta/ette* is a rather rare construction, reported from 14th, 15th and early 16th century codices. It died out shortly after this time and is completely obsolete in present-day Hungarian. Most often, *-atta/ette* is translated into English with an *-ing* form.

The non-finite ending is *-Vtt* (sometimes *-t*), this is always followed by person-number agreement (*-a/e* in third person).¹ There are data for all members of the paradigm from codices, except 1st person plural.

The data in this handout come from three early codices: Jókai C. (1372, the first continuous Hungarian text, life and deeds of Francis of Assisi), Vienna C. (1466, translation of parts of the Old Testament) and Munich C. (1466, translation of the four gospels).

There are data from many other codices, but they haven't been collected in a systematic manner.

Károly (1956) has sifted through these codices for the data; I am using his database. A tagged (and growing) corpus of Old Hungarian is also available at <http://corpus.nytud.hu/rmk/>

Number of examples: 83 (Jókai C.: 1, Vienna C.: 17, Munich C.: 65)

Károly's discussion is descriptive in nature and is limited to 3–4 pages, later work cites his results without adding anything to it. No generative investigations so far.

¹I will gloss the participial ending as *-atta*. Keep in mind that *-atta* is, in fact, *-att-a*, a third person form. Translations are based on *Holy Bible, Today's New International Version (TNIV)*. 2004. International Bible Society. At selected places I have appropriated the TNIV text to fit the Hungarian text better.

2. Basic observations

The following observations have been made by Károly (1956) and ?.

The overt modifiers internal to the participial clause: subject, object (with overt Accusative case), adverb.

-Atta/ette participles are always co-temporary with the main predicate.

Károly (1956): "csak cselekvő értelemben használatos" \approx only has an active reading.

Károly has identified three of the four uses I describe in the next section, he has found the dative modifier examples but didn't realize their significance.

3. Four uses

For now, I want to remain neutral about the nature of the gap in the participial clause, so I label it *e*.

3.1. Embedded subject = matrix object

55 examples, matrix predicates: *lát* 'see', *hall* 'hear', *lel* 'find', *megfog* 'catch, find', *megőriz* 'keep safe'

- (1) es ok hog lat-ac **o-t-èt** [e a· tenger-en iar-atta]
and they when see-3PL he-ACC-ACC the see-on walk-atta.3SG
'when they saw him walking on the sea'
Munich C., 42 ra (Mark 6,49)
- (2) lel-e a· **lean-t** [e a3 ag-on vl-ettè]
find-PAST.3SG the girl-ACC the bed-on sit-atta.3SG
'found the girl sitting on the bed'
Munich C., 43 rb (Mark 7,30)

3.2. Embedded subject = matrix dative

3 examples

- (3) **A3-oc-nak** ke· [e meg-od-att-oc a vèhm-et] mōd-a-nac o
that-PL-DAT prt prt-tie-atta-3PL the colt-ACC say-PAST-3PL he
vr-a-i o-nèki-c mi-t ogga-toc meg a· uèhm-èt
owner-POSS-PL they-DAT-3PL what-ACC tie-3PL prt the colt-ACC
'As they were untying the colt, its owners asked them: Why are you untying the colt?'
Munich C., 78 rb (Luke 19,33)

- (4) Mèn-tɔl vtolbʒè ke a· **tiʒ-en** **eg-nc** [e egembè ul-ètt-ec]
 all-from lastly prt the ten-SUFFIX one-DAT together sit-atta-3PL
 ièlen-ec ɔ-nèki-c ic
 appear-PAST.3SG they-DAT-3PL Jesus
 ‘Finally Jesus appeared to the Eleven as they were together sitting’
 Munich C., 53 va (Mark 16,14)
- (5) es **nemel,1,-èc-nèc** [e a· tèmplom-rol bèʒèll-ètt-ec] hog io
 and some-PL-DAT the temple-about speak-atta-3PL that good
 kɔu-èc-kel es aiandok-oc-kal èkèʒitètèt volna]] mōd-a
 stone-PL-WITH and gift-PL-WITH adorned aux say-PAST.3SG
 ‘To some who were remarking about how the temple was adorned with beautiful
 stones and gifts, Jesus said’
 Munich C., 79 vb (Luke 21,5)

3.3. Embedded subject = matrix subject

4 examples (see section 4.4 for discussion on the bracketing)

- (6) Aʒ-oc-kal ke· **ic** [e vačoral-atta,] veu-e a· kenèr-èt es
 that-PL-WITH prt Jesus dine-atta.3SG take-PAST.3SG the bread-ACC and
 meg-ald-a
 prt-bless-PAST.3SG
 ‘While he was dining with them, Jesus took bread and blessed it’
 Munich C., 32 va (Matthew 26,26)
- (7) es **ɔ taneituañ-i** [e iar-att-ok] keʒd-enc gabona fɔ-t ʒaggat-ni-oc.
 and he disciple-POSS.PL walk-atta-3PL start-3PL wheat ear pick-INF-3PL
 ‘and as his disciples walked along, they began to pick some ears of wheat’
 Munich C., 37 vb (Mark 2,23)

3.4. Temporal adverbial clause, lexical subject w/ disjoint reference

21 examples

- (8) [ɔ meg è bèʒèll-ettè] im fènès kɔd kɔrniekeʒ-e m̄g ɔ-t-èt
 he while this speak-atta.3SG prt bright cloud approach prt he-ACC-ACC
 ‘while he was still speaking, a bright cloud covered them’
 Munich C., 23 rb (Matthew 17,5)
- (9) [aʒoc èuèʒ-ett-ec] ke· ɔ èlalu-ec
 they row-atta-3PL prt he fall.asleep-PAST.3SG
 ‘As they sailed, he fell asleep.’
 Munich C., 63 vb (Luke 8,23)

4. Main analytical questions

4.1. The range of verbs that can be turned into *-atta/ette* participles

No restriction on argument structure: transitives, unaccusatives, unergatives, as well as a weather verb (*blow*). The list below is representative but not exhaustive.

The participial verb can be

- transitive: *beszél* (tr.) ‘say sth’, *elfordít* ‘lead astray’, *fűt(i önmagát)* ‘lit. heat oneself’, *seper* ‘sweep’, *tanít* (tr.) ‘teach’,
- unaccusative: *áll* ‘stand’, *beteglik* ‘be sick’, *elfut* ‘run away’, *éhezik* ‘starve’, *fekszik* ‘lay’, *felkel* ‘resurrect’, *fúj* ‘blow(wind)’, *függ* ‘hang’, *jár* ‘go’, *jön* ‘come’, *ül* ‘sit’,
- unergative: *munkálkodik* ‘work’, *nevet* ‘laugh’, *imádkozik* ‘pray’, *(egbè) kérdezkedik* ‘argue’, *eszik* (intr.) ‘eat’, *evez* ‘row’

No difference with respect to the four uses:

- embedded subject = matrix object
 - unergative: *nevet* ‘laugh’, *imádkozik* ‘pray’
 - unaccusative: *ül* ‘sit’, *éhezik* ‘starve’, *jön* ‘come’, *fekszik* ‘lay’
 - transitive: *unszol* ‘’, *seper* ‘sweep’
- embedded subject = matrix Dative
 - unergative: no example, but only 3 sentences in this group anyways
 - unaccusative: *ül* ‘sit’
 - transitive: *beszél* ‘speak, say’, *megold* ‘untie’
- embedded subject = matrix subject
 - unergative: no example, but only 4 sentences in this group anyways
 - unaccusative: *jár* ‘walk’, *bemegy* ‘go in’
 - transitive: *vesz* ‘take’, *emel* ‘lift, raise’
- temporal adv. clause w/ lexical subject
 - unergative: *evezik* ‘row’, *országol* ‘reign’
 - unaccusative: *áll* ‘stand’, *bemegy* ‘go in’, *jár* ‘walk’
 - transitive: *beszél* ‘speak, say’, *tanít* ‘teach’

4.2. The position of the ‘gap’

The gap is (almost always) in the subject position. There is one exception, with the idiom in (10).

- (10) a hideg lel-i X-et
the cold.nom find-3sg X-acc
i) ‘to shiver with cold or from fever’
ii) ‘to averse from or abhor sth, to give sy the creeps’

(10) is problematic in and of itself because it is a subject+verb idiom.

- (11) lat-a o napa-t [[fèk-ette] es [**hideg lel-ettè**]]
see-PAST.3SG he mother.in.law-ACC lay-atta.3SG and cold find-atta.3SG
‘he (Jesus) saw his (Peter’s) mother-in-law lying in bed and shivering with fever’
Munich C., 14 rb (Matthew 8,14)

(11) contradicts two overarching generalizations: i) the gap of the *-atta/ette* clause is in the subject position ((11) has an object experiencer gap), and ii) *-atta/ette* participles are active participles.

4.3. The nature of the ‘gap’

The gap as a trace: the DP coreferent with the gap is raised from the embedded clause.

Problem: in (12) the relevant DP precedes the matrix subject (so it is in the matrix clause), and it is postverbal. Hungarian has no extraction to postverbal position.

- (12) Es lát-t-ac vala o-t-èt a. uen-ec egmenden nap-on
and see-PAST-3PL aux she-ACC-ACC the old.man-PL every day-on
[bè-men-ette es teftoua iar-atta,]
in-go-atta.3SG and up.and.down walk-atta.3SG
‘And the old men saw her going in every day, and walking up and down’
Vienna C., 168 (Daniel 13,8)

Thus the only kind of movement that could be involved here is Raising to Object (if we believe in that). The RTO analysis won’t extend to cases in which the relevant DP is the subject or dative argument of the clause.

The gap is a PRO: link bw. the coreferent DP and the gap is established via Control.

Problem 1: the subject of *-atta/ette* participles may be filled by a lexical subject **or** a gap, and the literature would like to maintain complementary distribution between lexical subjects and PRO (but see Sundaresan and McFadden (2009, to appear) and references cited therein for claims that this position is untenable).

Problem 2: in case the gap is co-referent with the matrix object or dative, not all matrix predicates look like a control predicate. Some of these verbs cannot take a clausal complement at all.

- (13) Object coreference
lát ‘see’, *hall* ‘hear’, *lel* ‘find’, *megőriz* ‘keep safe’, *megfog* ‘find, catch red-handed’;
 example from Peer Codex: *imád* ‘worship’
- (14) Dative coreference
jelenik ‘appear’, *mond* ‘say’, *beszél* ‘say, talk’

The gap is a relative operator: *-atta/ette* clauses modifying a matrix argument are non-finite relative clauses.

Problem 1: with the 3 Dative coreference examples, the *-atta/ette* clause is adjacent to the Dative²; with 3 of the 4 subject coreference examples the *-atta/ette* clause is adjacent to the matrix subject³; but with the object coreference examples the matrix object and the *-atta/ette* clause can be far apart.

coreferent object DP immediately precedes the matrix verb:

- (15) **o-t-èt** latuai-oc [a· tenger-è iar-atta] meg zomorod-a-nac
 he-ACC-ACC see-PAST.3SG the sea-on walk-atta.3SG prt terrified-PAST-3PL
 ‘When they (i.e. the disciples) saw him (i.e. Jesus) walking on the sea, they became terrified’
 Munich C., 21 rb (Matthew 14,26)

coreferent object DP precedes a preverbal adverb, the matrix verb and the postverbal subject, *-atta/ette* clause follows subject but modifies object:

- (16) **ki-t** mico lat-ot uolna neminèmo leañ [a· világ-nal ül-èttè]
 who-ACC when see-PAST.3SG aux some girl the light-at sit-atta.3SG
 ‘when some girl saw him sitting at the fire’
 Munich C., 82 ra (Luke 22,58)
- (17) **ež-t** mico lat-t-a-uolna ic [fek-ètte]
 this-ACC when see-PAST-3SG-AUX Jesus lie-atta.3SG
 ‘When Jesus saw him lying’
 Munich C., 89 ra (John 5,6)

The above sentences contain the matrix predicate *lát* ‘see’, which might pass for a control predicate, but *lel* ‘talál’ is not a control predicate, and separation is OK.

- (18) Az paraszt-rol ky **zent fferencz-et** lewl-te-uala [egyhaz
 the peasant-about who holy francis-ACC find-PAST.3SG-AUX church
 sepr-ette]
 sweep-atta.3SG
 ‘About the peasant who found Francis sweeping the church’
 Jókai C., 097/13 - 1/11903

²There is one example where a discourse particle intervenes, otherwise strict adjacency.

³In the remaining one sentence the overt subject is in the embedded clause, and the matrix clause has *pro*, c.f. (26).

Problem 2: there are examples where the *-atta/ette* clause modifies a DP with a finite relative modifier

- (19) lel-ec **aʒ èmber-t** [ki-bɔl aʒ ɔrdog ki
 find-PAST.3PL the man-ACC who-from the devil out go-PAST.3SG-AUX
 men-t-uala] [vl-èttè ɔ lab-a-i-nal] es meg felèmenèc
 sit-atta.3SG he foot-POSS-PL-at and prt afraid.3PL
 ‘they found the man from whom the demons had gone out, sitting at Jesus’ feet;
 and they were afraid’
 Munich C., 64 rb (Luke 8,35)
- (20) Ihē aʒert hog lat-a ɔ-t-èt fir-atta es
 Jesus therefore when see-PAST.3SG he-ACC-ACC cry-ATTA.3SG and
a· fido-k-at [ki-c iɔtt-èc-uala ɔ uèl-ec] [fir-att-oc]
 the Jew-PL-ACC who-PL come-PAST.3PL-AUX they with-3PL cry-atta-3PL
 ‘When Jesus saw her weeping, and the Jews who had come along with her also
 weeping,’
 Munich C., 97 va (John 11,33)

4.4. The analysis of embedded subject = matrix subject participles from Section 3.3

The dilemma here is whether to assume a separate, fourth kind of use for *-atta/ette* participles (non-finite subject relative or subject control) or to say that they are a subtype of *-atta/ette* participles with lexical subjects (the embedded and matrix subjects accidentally have the same reference, with one of the subjects being *pro*). Until evidence comes forth for the contrary, I will assume the latter position.

- (21) es ɔ taneituañ-i **iar-att-ok** keʒd-enc gabona fɔ-t ʒaggat-ni-oc.
 and he disciple-POSS.PL walk-atta-3PL start-3PL wheat ear pick-INF-3PL
 ‘and as his disciples walked along, they began to pick some ears of wheat’
 Munich C., 37 vb (Mark 2,23)

Analysis 1a: *pro* matrix subject, overt embedded subject

- (22) es [ɔ taneituañ-i iar-att-ok] *pro* keʒd-enc gabona fɔ-t ʒaggat-ni-oc.
 and he disciple-POSS.PL walk-atta-3PL start-3PL wheat ear pick-INF-3PL
 ‘and as his disciples walked along, they began to pick some ears of wheat’

Analysis 1b: overt matrix subject, *pro* embedded subject

- (23) es ɔ taneituañ-i [*pro* iar-att-ok] keʒd-enc gabona fɔ-t ʒaggat-ni-oc.
 and he disciple-POSS.PL walk-atta-3PL start-3PL wheat ear pick-INF-3PL
 ‘and as his disciples walked along, they began to pick some ears of wheat’

Analysis 2: subject control

- (24) es ɔ̣ taneituañ-i [PRO iar-att-ok] keʒd-enc gabona fɔ̣-t
 and he disciple-POSS.PL walk-atta-3PL start-3PL wheat ear
 ʒaggat-ni-oc.
 pick-INF-3PL
 ‘and as his disciples walked along, they began to pick some ears of wheat’

Analysis 3: relative clause

- (25) es ɔ̣ taneituañ-i [RC e iar-att-ok] keʒd-enc gabona fɔ̣-t ʒaggat-ni-oc.
 and he disciple-POSS.PL walk-atta-3PL start-3PL wheat ear pick-INF-3PL
 ‘and as his disciples walked along, they began to pick some ears of wheat’

Potential support for Analysis 1 would be a sentence with overt, coreferent DPs in both the matrix and the embedded clauses, but there are no such examples. (26), however, shows that the embedded subject can have an overt subject coreferent with the main clause subject (the latter being *pro*), providing potential support for Analysis 1.

- (26) [&P [èʒ-ek-èt bèʒell-èttè ic] es [ɔ̣ ʒem-è-i-t meñ-bè
 this-PL-ACC speak-atta.3SG Jesus and he eye-POSS-PL-ACC heaven-into
 èmèl-uē]] mōd-a
 lift-participle say-PAST.3SG
 ‘After Jesus said this, he looked toward heaven and said’
 Müncheni K., 103 rb (János 17,1)

4.5. The size of the embedded clause

The clause structure of É. Kiss (2002):

- (27) TopP > DistP > AspP > vP

Embedded clause material preceding the participial verb can be:

subject:

- (28) [ɔ̣ ke aʒ ait-on - ki men-ètte,] lat-a ɔ̣-t-èt mas leañ
 he prt the door-on out go-atta.3SG see-PAST.3SG he-ACC-ACC another girl
 ‘Then he went out to the gateway, where another servant girl saw him’
 Munich C., 33 vb (Máté 26,71)

→ only shows that *-atta/ette* clauses have a vP layer

verbal particle:

- (29) minèmo fa alat lat-t-ad o-k-èt [**egbè** bèzell-ètt-ec]
what.kind.of tree under see-PAST-2SG he-PL-ACC together speak-ATTA-3PL
'What kind of tree did you see them conversing under?'
Vienna C., 172 (Daniel 13,54)

→ evidence for AspP in É. Kiss' system

spatial PP (locative, source and goal):

- (30) lat-a Leui-t alfeus fi-a-t [**a· vam-on** vl-ettè]
see-PAST.3SG Levi-ACC Alpheus son-POSS-ACC the tax.booth-on sit-atta.3SG
'he saw Levi son of Alpheus sitting at the tax collector's booth'
Munich C., 37 va (Mark 2,14)

→ what this shows depends on what your theory of PP modifiers is

object:

- (31) es micor lat-ta volna pèter-t - [**o-mága-t** fuit-ette]
and when see-PAST.3SG aux Peter-ACC he-self-ACC warm-atta.3SG
'And when she saw Peter warming himself'
Munich C., 52 ra (Mark 14,67)

→ the object could be in TopicP, or it could be in its merge-in position and then it shows nothing (see Section 6 on OV/VO)

adverb

- (32) [**Q meg** è bèzell-ettè] im fènès kəð kərnekez-e m̄g o-t-èt
he while this speak-atta.3SG prt bright cloud approach prt he-ACC-ACC
'while he was still speaking, a bright cloud covered them'
Munich C., 23 rb (Matthew 17,5)

discourse particle *ke*.

- (33) [**Q ke**· èz-ek-èt bèzell-ette] lən nag kəð
he prt this-PL-ACC speak-atta.3SG appear.PAST.3SG big cloud
'While he was speaking, a big cloud appeared'
Munich C., 66 ra (Luke 9,34)

→ what this shows depends on what your theory of discourse particles is (but they are generally taken to be high)

Hungarian quantifier phrases that move to spec, DistP: *mindig* 'always', *mindenhol* 'everywhere', *minden X* 'every X', *mindkét X* 'both X', *hét X-et is* 'as many as 7', etc. Something like this in pre-participial position would constitute strong evidence for an ar-

ticulated structure of these time adverbials. Focus would also be a good indicator of this. Unfortunately no examples.

5. Tense, finiteness and Nominative case with *-atta/ette*

5.1. The temporal dependence of the participial clause

Tóth (2000) on the co-temporaenity of *-va* participles:

These participles are adjoined to VoiceP. "From this position the event argument of the base verb can be saturated (existentially bound) by the Tense operator of the main clause giving rise to an eventive interpretation of the participle. Since both the event argument of the main verb and that of the participle are bound by the same Tense operator, the events described by the main verb and by the participle must be simultaneous." (p. 247.)

I am inclined to blame the co-temporaenity of *-atta/ette* participles on the absence or a particular setting of the Fin head. Details remain to be worked out.

5.2. The source of Nominative case on the embedded lexical subject

In the mainstream view, Nominative case is assigned/checked by finite T. *-Atta/ette* participles contain no finite T. Several hypotheses on the market about where Nominative can come from in non-finite clauses:

- Tóth (2000) on *-ván/vén* participles⁴: *-n* is a complementizer, NOM assignment is possible via this Comp.
- É. Kiss (2002) on *-ván/vén* participles: *-n* is Tense, it assigns Nominative. Extending this to *emph-atta/ette* participles, *-Vtt* may be Tense.
- Nádasdy (to appear): he discusses *-ván/vén* participles, and suggests that their lexical subject is in the Genitive case. Extending this to *-atta/ette* participles, they may be in this unmarked Genitive.
- Schütze (2001): Default case is often Nominative or Accusative. In Hungarian, all default case environments (coordinated subjects, appositive subject pronouns, subject pronouns in gapping, modified pronouns, elliptical answer to subject question, left dislocation/hanging topic) show Nominative → NOM could be a default case on the subject here as well

⁴These participles are still in use in contemporary Hungarian, they can have an overt lexical DP subject in the nominative (but overt pronominal subjects are ungrammatical).

- (i) [A kapu be-csukód-ván,] Aladdin egy barlang-ban talál-t-a magá-t.
the gate in-close-ván Aladdin a cave-in find-PAST-3SG self-ACC
'The gate having closed, Aladdin found himself in a cave.' (É. Kiss 2002, p. 222., ex. 71.)

- Sundaresan and McFadden (2009, to appear): Nominative is independent of finiteness, assigned internally to the infinitival and gerundival clauses they discuss
- Nom could come from the agreement marker: Pollock (1989) split T into T and AGR, the presence of AGR may be enough for Nominative case to surface (if the real assigner is AGR and not T). C.f. the literature on infinitives with an independent lexical subject (Portuguese, etc.), and Sárík (1998) on *-ván/vén* (he suggests that *-ván/vén* has person agreement and agreement assigns NOM)

6. The OV/VO parameter and Accusative case

6.1. Accusative is optional for preverbal objects

Accusative case is not optional at this stage of the Hungarian language. My colleagues have found, however, that in another type of participle it comes and goes rather freely.

In *-atta/ette* participles, Accusative can come and go preverbally but postverbally object must be marked for Accusative. No pronominal vs. non-pronominal divide.

17 of the 83 sentences have an overt object, 16 with a DP object and 1 with a clausal object.

object+accusative > verb: 7 examples

- (34) \emptyset ke· èz-ek-èt **bèžell-ette** lön nag kōd
 he prt this-PL-ACC speak-atta.3SG appear.PAST.3SG big cloud
 ‘While he was speaking, a big cloud appeared’
 Munich C., 66 ra (Luke 9,34)

object > verb: 6 examples

- (35) Az paraszt-rol ky zent fferencz-et lewl-te-uala egyhaz
 the peasant-about who holy francis-ACC find-PAST.3SG-AUX church
sepr-ette
 sweep-atta.3SG
 ‘About the peasant who found Francis sweeping the church’
 Jókai C., 097/13 - 1/11903

verb > object+accusative: 3 examples

- (36) Hall-ac a· leualta-c a· golekezèt-ek-èt **morg-att-oc**
 hear-PAST.3PL the Pharisee-PL the crowd-PL-ACC whisper-atta-3PL
 \emptyset -roll-a èz-ek-èt
 he-about-3SG this-PL-ACC
 ‘The Pharisees heard the crowd whispering these about him’
 Munich C., 92 vb (John 7,32)

verb > object: not found in the mini-corpus

This pattern is good news for the *Hungarian generative diachronic syntax* project. The hypothesis is that Hungarian used to be an SOV language, with O being morphologically unmarked. The appearance of object morphology was a prerequisite for O to appear elsewhere and for the word order to change. In constructions where the object marker didn't appear, the original SOV was retained.

6.2. OV/VO with participles featuring a lexical subject

The three codices: 21 sentences such that the embedded temporal clause has an overt lexical subject disjoint in reference from the matrix subject, 9 of them have an overt object. In all cases, the object precedes the verb.

Covert subject, overt object:

- O > V (2 examples)

(37) | è̄z-ek-èt **bè̄zell-èttè** | fok-ac hùn-c ȝ-bèle
 this-PL-ACC speak-atta.3SG many-PL believe-3PL he-into
 ‘As he spoke, many put their faith in him’
 Munich C., 94 ra (John 8,30)

- V > O: no data

Overt subject, overt object:

- S > O > V (7 examples)

(38) ȝ ke· è̄z-ek-èt **bè̄zell-ette** lȝn nag kȝd
 he prt this-PL-ACC speak-atta.3SG appear.PAST.3SG big cloud
 ‘While he was speaking, a big cloud appeared’
 Munich C., 66 ra (Luke 9,34)

- no data for the other possibilities (S > V > O, O > V > S, O > S > V, V > S > O, V > O > S)

6.3. OV/VO with the other types of *-atta/ette* clauses

Object coreference: 5 sentences with object, 3 O > V and 2 V > O

Dative coreference: 2 sentences with object, V > O and V > clause

Subject coreference: 1 sentence with object, O > V

6.4. Summary of OV/VO

17 sentences with an overt object altogether

16 with DP object and 1 with clausal object

13 with O > V

4 with V > O (one of these is the clausal object)

These data provide potential support for the research group’s hypothesis that changes in word order first took place in finite clauses, and non-finite clauses remained more conservative in their word order for a while.

References

- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Károly, Sándor. 1956. *Igenévrendszereink a kódexirodalom első szakaszában [The system of non-finite forms in the early codices]*. Nyelvtudományi értekezések 10. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Nádasdy, Péter. to appear. Az univerzális grammatika szempontjából lehet-e a -ván, -vénnek alanya? [Can -ván, -vén participles have a subject from the viewpoint of universal grammar?]. In *Proceedings of Lingdok 12*, ed. Zsuzsanna Gécseg. Szeged: JATE.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:365–424.
- Sárik, Pál. 1998. A határozói igenevek néhány problémája [Some problems surrounding adverbial participles]. *Magyar Nyelv* 94:423–435.
- Schütze, Carson. 2001. On the nature of default case. *Syntax* 4:205–238.
- Sundaresan, Sandhya, and Thomas McFadden. 2009. Subject distribution in Tamil and other languages: selection vs. case. *Journal of South Asian Linguistics* 2:5–34.
- Sundaresan, Sandhya, and Thomas McFadden. to appear. Nominative case is independent of finiteness and agreement. *Papers from BCGL 5: case at the interfaces*.
- Tóth, Ildikó. 2000. -Va and -ván participles in Hungarian. In *Approaches to Hungarian 7: papers from the Pécs conference*, ed. Gábor Alberti and István Kenesei, 239–256. Szeged: JATE.