REANALYSIS IN HUNGARIAN COMPARATIVE SUBCLASSES

0. The problem

Modern Hungarian: comparative subclauses are introduced by mint ‘than’, which can be followed by an overt comparative operator (e.g. ahányszor ‘x-many times’)

Old Hungarian: comparative subclauses were initially and typically introduced by hogy ‘that’, and the comparative operator was covert

→ the development of the complementiser and of the operator are interrelated processes

  reanalysis of the complementiser
  change in the deletion of the operator

1. The structure of comparatives

(1) Anna ma többször telefonált Moszkvába, mint ahányszor Miki szokott.

  ‘Ann phoned to Moscow more times today than Mike usually does.’

reference value of comparison: QP in the matrix clause

standard value of comparison: subclause

comparative subclause: CP, in Modern Hungarian introduced by the complementiser mint ‘than’ (cf. Kenesei 1992), representing comparative Force (see Rizzi 1999)

below the mint-CP there is another CP, to the specifier of which the comparative operator moves via operator movement (Chomsky 1977; Kennedy and Merchant 2000):

(2) CP
    /   
   C’  
  /   
CForce CP
    /  
mint OP
      / 
CFin ...
Rizzi’s analysis of the Left Periphery (Rizzi 1997: 297):

(3) [CP [TopP [FocP [TopP [CP]]]]]

Modern Hungarian: mint is base-generated in the higher C head, and the operator moves to the lower [Spec; CP] – see Kántor (2008a); the operator can be overt:

(4) Marinak több macskája van, mint ahány macskája Péternek van. Mary-Dat. more cat-Poss.3.Sg. is than x-many cat-Poss.3.Sg. Peter-Dat. is ‘Mary has more cats than Peter.’

2. Parametric variation in the subclause

deletion phenomena – Comparative Deletion (CD)

... an operation responsible for eliminating the QP from the comparative subclause, if it is logically identical with the one in the matrix clause (Bacskai-Atkari 2010: 10)

English: [+CD] language

(5a) *Ann is more enthusiastic than Peter is enthusiastic.

(5b) Ann is more enthusiastic than Peter is ___ .

when the QP is contained within a DP, the entire DP has to be moved (← DP island constraint, see Izvorski 1995: 217; Kántor 2008b: 148–149; on the constraint, see Kayne 1983; Ross 1986; Bošković 2005; Grebenyova 2004)

(6a) *Susan has bigger cats than Peter has cats.

(6b) Susan has bigger cats than Peter has ___ .

as opposed to English, Modern Hungarian is a [–CD] language:

(7a) Anna lelkessebb, mint amilyen lelkes Miki. Ann more.enthusiastic than x-much enthusiastic Mike ‘Ann is more enthusiastic than Mike.’

(7b) Zsuzsának nagyobb macskái vannak, mint amilyen nagy macskái Péternek vannak. Susan-Dat. bigger cats are than x-much big cats Peter Dat. are ‘Susan has bigger cats than Peter has.’
3. Diachronic change in Hungarian – an overview

in Old Hungarian, the subclause was initially introduced by hogy ‘that’, and the subclause also contained the negative element nem ‘not’ (Haader 2003a: 515):

(8a) Mert iob hog megfog’dofuá algukmég’ vrát hog né méghal’l’óc because better that caught-Past.Part. bless-3.Pl.Subj. Lord-Acc. that not die-3.Pl.Subj. ‘because it is better that we should bless the Lord caught than die’

(BécsiK. 25)

(8b) mert emberi elme, mindenkoron kezzebb az gonozra, hog’ nem az iora because human mind always readier the evil-Subl. that not the good ‘because the human mind is always readier for evil than for good’

(BodK. 2r)

later, mint ‘than’ could appear as well in typical sequences such as hogy nem mint ‘that not than’ – characteristic of Middle Hungarian (Haader 2003a: 515, 2003b: 681):

(9a) maſtan kozelben vagyon a’my Idweſľegwünk honnemmynt eleeb hyttok now nearer is the.our salvation-3.Pl.Poss. that.not than before thought-3.Pl. ‘our salvation is nearer now than we thought before’

(ÉrdyK. 3; ex. from Haader 2003a: 515)

(9b) az mentől alsobŷkban is tob angýal uagon honnemŷnth 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)

the heads hogy, nem (also sem ‘nor’) and mint could fuse (see Haader 2003a: 515; Kenesei 1992: 43)

the element nem later could be left out, giving the sequence hogy mint (Haader 2003a: 515):

(15) edesseget erze nagyoban hogŷmint annak elotte sweetness-Acc. felt-3.Sg. bigger that.than that-Dat. before-Poss. ‘he felt sweetness more than before’

(LázK. 140; ex. from Haader 2003a: 515)
some data from the Old Hungarian corpus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>hogy nem</th>
<th>hogy nem mint</th>
<th>mint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jókai</td>
<td>btw. 1372 and 1448</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Müncheni</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bécsi</td>
<td>btw. 1416 and 1450</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birk</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weszprémi</td>
<td>around 1512</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gömöry</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sándor</td>
<td>around 1518</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozsonyi</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bod</td>
<td>after 1520</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Székelyudvarhelyi</td>
<td>1526–1528</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Reanalysis and parametric change

The initial setup:  
- the subclause is introduced by the \( C_{\text{Force}} \) head \( \text{hogy} \) ‘that’  
- the comparative operator is obligatorily deleted – [+CD] parameter  
- the subclause contains the element \( \text{nem} \) ‘not’ (← comparative Force)

\[
(11) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C}_{\text{Force}} \\
\text{hogy} \\
\text{OP}_{(\text{cov.})} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C}_{\text{Fin}} \\
\end{array}
\]


- fusion with other heads (see above)
- introduces other finite clauses in the period – \( \text{that} \)-clauses, relative clauses
  (Haader 2003a, 1991; Galambos 1907)

- similar behaviour in other languages as well: Italian \( \text{che} \) or French \( \text{que} \) introduce comparative subclauses and also finite declarative clauses; these are C heads (see Rizzi 1997; Rowlett 2007: 147–148)
(12) Maria mangia più che Paolo.  
Mary eats more than Paul  
‘Mary eats more than Paul.’

(13) Anne est plus fatiguée que Marie.  
Ann is more tired than Mary  
‘Ann is more tired than Mary.’

The relation of *hogy* and *hogy nem*

The presence of the negative element can be observed in other languages as well (see Salvi–Vanelli 2004: 283–285):

(14) Maria mangia più che non Paolo.  
Mary eats more than not Paul  
‘Mary eats more than Paul.’

(15) L’exemple touche plus que ne fait la menace.  
the.example touches more than not does the-Fem. threat  
‘Examples touch more than threat does.’ (Corneille)

Fusion: *hogy* and *nem* could also fuse: *hogynem* complex complementiser (Juhász 1991: 489, 494)

Possibly also phonological change: *honnem*

(16) ez vilagýakrol kínneb embornek eerteekoznýe honnem az menýeýekrol  
this mundane-Pl.Del. easier man-Dat. dissert-Inf. that.not the heavenly-Pl.Del.  
‘it is easier for man to dissert on mundane than on heavenly matters’  
(SándK. 1r)

→ two C heads: *hogy* and *hogyem*

The relative cycle as a grammaticalization process


English *that* – the pronoun moving to [Spec; CP] is reinterpreted as part of that CP, i.e. as a C head – van Gelderen (2009: 107): first in C_fin, later in C_force position
The appearance of mint

analogous structure with ordinary relatives

in Old Hungarian, and especially in Middle Hungarian, the sequence *hogy* + relative pronoun was frequent (see Galambos 1907: 14–18; see also Haader 1995, Dömötör 1995)

it could also become a complex complementiser (Juhász 1992: 792; Haader 1995)

(18) ollyaat tezok raýtad hog kytol felz
such-Acc. do-1.Sg. you-Sup. that what-Abl. fear-2.Sg.
‘I will do such to you that from which you will fear’

(SándK. 14v)


structure:

(19)

the hypothesis of Galambos (1907: 15): the relative pronoun was closer to its original pronominal function – later *hogy* becoming completely redundant

→ first step of the relative cycle: becoming relative pronoun
in comparatives: similarly to relative pronouns, the comparative operator appears in the lower [Spec; CP]: mint (relative pronoun, see Juhász 1991: 480–481; no phonological distinction ~ other relative pronouns, e.g. ki ‘who-Int.’ vs. ki ‘who-Rel.‘)

(20) $\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\quad \text{C'} \\
\quad \quad \text{C}_{\text{Force}} \quad \text{CP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{hogy}(\text{nem}) \quad \text{mint} \quad \text{C'} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{C}_{\text{Fin}} \quad \ldots \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Ø}
\end{array}$

the appearance of mint: possible because no other operator – similar phenomenon in other [+CD] languages:

(21a) % John is taller than what Mary is. (Chomsky 1977: 87, ex. 51a)

(21b) % Die Welt ist mehr, als was wir sehen. (German)

the-Fem. world is more than what we see-1.Pl.

‘The world is more than what we see.’

(21c) % Er ist besser als wie du. (German)

he is better than how you

‘He is better than you.’

no sensitivity to the subtype of comparative (↔ Modern Hungarian)

proform: the pronoun stands for the entire QP, DP – does not contain a lexical AP or NP

G. Varga (1992: 525): the late Old Hungarian relative pronoun system still lacked the elements milyen ‘how’, amilyen ‘how-Rel.’; mekkora ‘how big, amekkora ‘how big-Rel.’

Old Hungarian is [+CD] before the appearance of mint; later [–CD]
The reanalysis of *mint*

second step of the relative cycle: operator → C head

→ *mint* is generated in \( C_{\text{Fin}} \); \( C_{\text{Force}} \) still contains *hogy(nem)*

*mint*: remained insensitive to the choice of the matrix pronominal element (i.e. *annyiszor* ‘many times’, *akkora* ‘much big’, *olyan* ‘how’, cf. Juhász 1992: 799), did not develop into a proper operator morphologically

\[ \leftrightarrow \text{other relative pronouns (e.g. } ki \text{ ‘who-Int.’ and } aki \text{ ‘who-Rel.’) } \]

(22)

```
(\text{CP})
    \text{C'}
       \text{C_{\text{Force}}}
          (\text{CP})
                  \text{hogy(nem)} \text{OP_{(cov.)}} \text{C'}
                      \text{C_{\text{Fin}}} \text{...}
                          \text{mint}
```

operator: empty (← Doubly Filled Complementiser Filter)

Reanalysis in terms of the two C heads

instead of \( C_{\text{Fin}} \), *mint* is generated in \( C_{\text{Force}} \) – in parallel with the disappearance of *hogy*

*mint* is interpreted as a head responsible for Force → structural change

disappearance of *hogy* makes it possible for *mint* to appear in the higher C head
in the specifier of the lower CP, the operator can appear again (~first step of the relative cycle)

relative pronouns (amennyi ‘x-many’, ahányszor ‘x-many times’, amilyen ‘how-Rel.’ etc.) → analogy (relative clauses)

Galambos (1907): purists (e.g. Zsigmond Simonyi) thought it to be unnecessary ↔ in fact, it is a repetition of a diachronic change

\[23\]

\[
\text{CP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C}_{\text{Force}} \\
\text{mint} \quad \text{CP} \\
\text{OP}_{(u,v)} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C}_{\text{Fin}} \\
\text{Ø} 
\]

**Conclusion**

→ the development of the complementiser and of the operator are strongly interrelated

relative cycle – reanalysis

analogy – the appearance of the operator

change in the deletion of the operator (whether it is obligatory)
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