THE DIACHRONIC SYSTEM OF THE LEFT PERIPHERY OF SUBORDINATE CLAUSES IN HUNGARIAN*

0. The problem

elements introducing subclauses in Modern Hungarian:

- simplex complementisers (C heads)
  
  *hogy ‘that’, ha ‘if’, mint ‘than/as’, mert ‘because’*

- complex complementisers (C heads)
  
  e.g. *hogyha ‘that if’, mintha ‘as if’, minthogyha ‘than that if’*

- relative pronominal operators (DPs, AdvPs)
  
  e.g. *aki ‘who-Rel.’, ahol ‘where-Rel.’*

- combinations of simplex complementisers and relative pronouns
  
  e.g. *mint amilyen ‘than how’*

positions (cf. Rizzi 1997):

(1) \[ \text{CP} \quad \text{C'} \quad \text{CP} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C} \\
\text{hogy} \\
\text{ha} \\
\text{mint} \\
\text{mert} \\
\text{hogyha} \\
\ldots
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{aki} \\
\text{ahol} \\
\text{amilyen} \\
\ldots
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{C'} \\
\ldots
\end{array}
\]

relative operators – move to [Spec; CP] via operator movement


C heads: base-generated in C – Modern Hungarian: only one C head is filled (~ Italian)

system: dynamic from a diachronic perspective

question: how the relation of the individual processes can be described

different processes vs. different timing

* The present research was funded by the project OTKA-78074.
1. Operators

hogy ‘that’, ha’ if’, mint ‘than’, mert ‘because’: originally operators

hogy ‘how’, ha ‘when’, mint ‘how’, mert ‘why’

relative pronouns – e.g. ki ‘who’, mi ‘what’

position:

(2)

```
  CP
  /\    /
 C'  C   CP
  /   \ha
 Ø    hogy
     mint
     mert
     REL Ø
```

2. Grammaticalisation

reanalysis: from operator to C head

relative cycle: an operator (an original pronoun) is reanalysed as a complementiser head
(Roberts and Roussou 2008; van Gelderen 2009)

~ English that

further reanalysis: from lower C heads to upper C heads ~ English that

(3)

```
  CP
  /\    /
 C'  C   CP
  /   \X
 Ø    C'   ...
     X
```

```
  CP
  /\    /
 C'  C   CP
  /   \X
 Ø    C'   ...
     X
```
functional split taking place in different times

\textit{hogy} and \textit{ha}: before the Old Hungarian period and in Early Old Hungarian

\textit{mint} and \textit{mert}: in Old and Middle Hungarian

→ difference in typical positions in Old and Middle Hungarian

\textit{ha} ‘if’: upper C

\textit{hogy} ‘that’: upper or lower C

\textit{mint} ‘than’, \textit{mert} ‘because’: lower C or lower [Spec; CP]

relative pronouns (e.g. \textit{ki} ‘who’) do not develop into C heads – lack of feature loss

positions (Old Hungarian):

(4) \begin{center}
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3. Combinations

possible co-occurrences in Old and Middle Hungarian:

- upper C + lower C
- upper C + operator (cf. Galambos 1907)

→ \textit{hamint} ‘if as’, \textit{hahogy} ‘if that’, \textit{ha} ‘if’ + relative pronoun

(5) \textbf{Ha} késen \textbf{hogy} el nyugot az nap, hamar esőt váry
if late that \textbf{PREV set-3.Sg. the sun soon \text{rain-Acc. expect-Imp.2.Sg.}}
‘if the sun has set late, expect rain soon’ (Cis. G3)

→ \textit{hogymint} ‘that than’, \textit{hogymert} ‘that because’, \textit{hogy} + relative pronoun

(6) olýaat tezkyk raýtad \textbf{hogy} kytli felz
such-Acc. do-1.Sg. you-Sup. that \textbf{what-Abl. fear-2.Sg.}
‘I will do such on you that you fear’ (SándK. 28)
structures:

(7) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
h_a \\
m_i_n_t \\
k_i \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{Ø}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
h_a \\
m_i_n_t
\end{array}
\]

negative-like MoodP may appear between the two CPs (cf. Bacskaï-Atkari 2011):

hogynemmint ‘that not than’, hogysemmint ‘that neither than’

(8) az mentől alsobŷkban is tob angýal uagon honemmýnth az napnak feneben the more down-Ine. also more angel is that.not than the sun-Dat. light-Poss.
‘there are more angels in the basest one of them than in the sun’s light’ (SándK. 1v)

structure:

(9) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
hogy \\
\text{MoodP} \\
\text{Mood'} \\
\text{Mood} \\
nem/sem \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{mint} \\
\end{array}
\]

English: similar combinations in Middle English – if that, for that (van Gelderen 2005)

(10) Blameth nat me if that ye chese amys. (Chaucer: The Canterbury Tales: Prologue)
4. Movement

lower C may move up to the upper one even if the latter is filled → adjunction

Kayne’s Linear Correspondence Axiom: adjunction results in the reverse order (Kayne 1994); cf. also the Mirror Principle of Baker (1985, 1988)

→ mintha ‘as if’, hogyha ‘that if’, minthogy ‘than that’, merthogy ‘because that’

(11) kí menének ʒocaʃoc ʒerent mint ha aʒ imadʃaʃa mënec out went-they custom-Poss.3.Pl. according than if the prayer-Subl. go-Cond.3.Pl. ‘they went out as was their custom, as if going for prayer’ (GuaryK. 113–114)

(12) hogyha, mintha, minthogy and merthogy in the gospels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hogyha</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mintha</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minthogy</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merthogy</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

hogyha ‘that/if’ + relative pronoun combinations: no inverse order as there is no movement either (not C heads)

grammaticalization: base-generation as a single C head (base-generation more economical than movement; cf. van Gelderen 2004)

structures:

(13) CP
    C
    C
    mint ha
    C
    t_i

    CP
    C
    C'
    ...
similarly in structures containing a negative-like MoodP:

(14)

```
  CP
 /   \
C'    \\
  C    MoodP
  |
mint\sem\hogy Mood'
  |
Mood  CP
  |
  t_{i,j}
  |
  C'
  |
  C
  |
  t_i
  |
  Ø
```

English: no such complex complementisers

movement of *that* to higher C: no head adjunction

morphological restrictions – cross-linguistic differences

timing – appearance in combinations vs. moving up

5. Further combinations

- the new grammaticalized simplex upper C heads may co-occur with new operators in the lower [Spec; CP]

→ *mint amilyen* ‘than how-Rel.’, *mint ahány* ‘than how many-Rel.’ (cf. Bacskaı-Atkari 2011)

structure:

(15)

```
  CP
 /   \
C'    \\
  C    CP
  |
mint amilyen C'
  |
  ahány
  |
  C
  |
  Ø
  ```
• grammaticalized complex upper C may co-occur with another in the lower C
  
  earliest grammaticalized complex C: högyha ‘that if’ (hogy: preferably moved up)
  
  Haader (2003): högyhamint ‘that if than’, minthogyha ‘than that if’

**högyhamint:**

(16)

```
   CP
    \  /    \  /  
   C'   C   CP
   /    \    /  
hogyha  C'  ...
   /     \    /
mint
```

**minthogyha:**

(17)

```
   CP
    \  /    \  /  
   C'   C   CP
   /    \    /  
mint, högyha  C'  ...
   /     \    /
  t_i
```

**6. Changes**

grammaticalization of complementisers in higher C

→ lower C remains unfilled, in Modern Hungarian there are no C + C combinations
  
  (hamint ‘if than’, hahogy ‘if that’, hogymint ‘that than’, hogymert ‘that because’)

↔ fully grammaticalized complex C heads

hogy ‘that’: functional change (cf. Bacskaï-Atkari 2012)

• general marker of subordination ~ in English (that)

• wide range of structures – relative clauses, clauses of reason

• högy + X vs. X + högy complex complementisers usually meaning ‘X’
Conclusion

changes in the Left Periphery: grammaticalization (e.g. the relative cycle)

diachronic processes are similar – differences in timing
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