Hungarian

**István Kenesei, Robert M. Vago
and Anna Fenyvesi**

Hungarian

Hungarian is spoken by 14–15 million people worldwide. A unique language, completely unrelated to the languages of its neighboring countries, it boasts a grammar full of complex features and a vocabulary deriving largely from a Uralic stock.

The book covers the phonological inflectional and derivational morphology, syntax, and fundamental lexicon of Hungarian. It gives a detailed summary of both the sound systems and rich case systems of Hungarian and illustrates their various uses. It summarizes the main processes of word formation and gives a detailed account of the sentence structure and the ways of combining words into sentences. It also lists the basic vocabulary of Hungarian.

Hungarian addresses current issues in the description of languages and applies up-to-date research techniques to Hungarian. This is the first comprehensive descriptive grammar of the Hungarian language available in English, and will appeal to both the professional linguist and advanced learner of Hungarian alike.

István Kenesei is editor of the series *Approaches to Hungarian* and Professor of Linguistics at József Attila University, Hungary. **Robert M. Vago** is Professor of Linguistics and Chair of the Department of Linguistics at Queens College of the City University of New York. Previous publications include *The Sound Pattern of Hungarian* (1980). **Anna Fenyvesi** is a doctoral candidate at the University of Pittsburgh; she is currently teaching at József Attila University, Hungary.

Descriptive Grammars
Series Editor: Bernard Comrie
University of Southern California

Editorial statement

Until quite recently, work on theoretical linguistics and work on language description proceeded almost entirely in isolation from one another. Work on theoretical linguistics, especially in syntax, concentrated primarily on English, and its results were felt to be inapplicable to those interested in describing other languages. Work on describing individual languages was almost deliberately isolationist, with the development of a different framework and terminology for each language or language group, and no feeding of the achievements of language description into linguistic theory. Within the last few years, however, a major rapprochement has taken place between theoretical and descriptive linguistics. In particular, the rise of language typology and the study of language universals have produced a large number of theoreticians who require accurate, well-formulated descriptive data from a wide range of languages, and have shown descriptive linguists that they can both derive benefit from and contribute to the development of linguistic theory. Even within genera-tive syntax, long the bastion of linguistic anglocentrism, there is an increased interest in the relation between syntactic theory and a wide range of language types.

For a really fruitful interaction between theoretical and descriptive lin-guistics, it is essential that descriptions of different languages should be comparable. The *Questionnaire* of the present series (originally published as *Lingua*, vol. 42 (1977), no. 1) provides a framework for the description of a language that is (a) sufficiently comprehensive to cover the major structures of any language that are likely to be of theoretical interest; (b) sufficiently explicit to make cross-language comparisons a feasible undertaking (in particular, through the detailed numbering key); and (c) sufficiently flexible to encompass the range of variety that is found in human language. The volumes that were published in the predecessor to the present series, the *Lingua Descriptive Studies* (now available from Routledge), succeeded in bridging the gap between theory and descrip-tion: authors include both theoreticians who are also interested in description and field-workers with an interest in theory.

The aim of the Descriptive Grammars is thus to provide descriptions of a wide range of languages according to the format set out in the *Questionnaire*. Each language will be covered in a single volume. The first priority of the series is grammars of languages for which detailed descriptions are not at present available. However, the series will also encompass descriptions of better-known languages with the series framework providing more detailed descriptions of such languages than are currently available (as with the monographs on West Greenlandic and Kannada).

Bernard Comrie

Hungarian

István Kenesei, Robert M. Vago, and
Anna Fenyvesi

Publisher's Note
The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this
reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original may be apparent

Contents

Symbols and Abbreviations

CASES (abbreviated by first few letters capitalized):

Case	Marker	English equivalent
ABLative	-tól/től	from
ACCusative	-t	(object)
ADEssive	-nál/nél	at
ALLative	-hoz/hez/höz	to
CAUsalis	-ért	for
DATive	-nak/nek	to, for
DELative	-ról/ről	off, about
ELAtive	-ból/ből	out of
ESSive	-ul/ül	as
(essive-)FORmal	-(ként) , -képpen	as
ILLative	-ba/be	into
INEssive	-ban/ben	in
INStrumental	-val/vel	with
NOMinative	∅	(subject)
SUBlative	-ra/re	onto
SUPeressive	-on/en/ön/n	on
TERminative	-ig	up to, until
TRAnslative	-vá/vé	(change) into

OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

*A	*A* is ungrammatical or unacceptable	?A	*A* has questionable acceptability
*(A)B	*B*, *AB* is grammatical	1PL	first person plural
(*A)B	**AB*, *B* is grammatical	1SG	first person singular
A(/)B	either *A* or *B* or both are grammatical	2OBJ	verbal suffix expressing a second person object
%A	*A* is grammatical for one dialect/sociolect/class of speakers	2PL	second person plural
		2SG	second person singular
		3PL	third person plural

3SG	third person singular	FPRT	future participle
ABL	ablative case	FREQ	frequentative
ACC	accusative case		derivational affix
ADE	adessive case	FUT	future
ADJDER	suffix deriving an	HABIT	auxiliary expressing
	adjective		present habitual action
ADV	adverbial derivational	ILL	illative case
	suffix (= '-ly')	IMP	imperative mood
AFX	(unspecified	INDEF	indefinite object
	derivational) affix		conjugation
ALL	allative case	INE	inessive case
APRT	active (present)	INF	infinitival suffix
	participle	INS	instrumental case
ATTR	-i (attributive suffix on	ITE	iterative case
	postpositions, time	ITER	suffix deriving iterative
	adverbials, and		verb
	placenames)	LOC	locative case
CAU	causal-final case	MOD	modal case
CAUS	causative derivational	MOE	modal-essive case
	affix	MUL	multiplicative case
CL	clitic	NML	nominalizer
CMP	comparative suffix		(derivational) affix
COL	suffix marking collective	NP	noun phrase
	plural	NPI	negative polarity item
COM	comitative case	ORD	suffix deriving an
CON	conditional mood		ordinal numeral
COND	conditional auxiliary	PAST	past tense suffix
DAT	dative case	PCVB	perfective converb
DEF	definite object		(adverbial participle)
	conjugation	PERM	auxiliary expressing
DEL	delative case		permission
DIM	diminutive suffix	PFX	preverbal prefix
DIS	distributive case	PL	plural (suffix)
DUR	suffix deriving a	POS	nominal possessive
	durative verb		suffix
ELA	elative case	POSS	possessive suffix
EMPH	emphasis marker	POT	suffix expressing
EMS	emphatic superlative		potentiality
	prefix	POTEN	auxiliary expressing
ENPI	existential negative		potentiality
	polarity item (= ca.	PPRT	passive (past) participle
	anything)	PRIV	privative suffix
ESS	essive case	PROHIB	auxiliary expressing
FOR	(essive-)formal case		prohibition

PRT	particle	TEM	temporal case
Q	yes–no question clitic	TER	terminative case
REFL	reflexivizing derivational affix	TRA	translative case
		UNIQ	unique identification suffix
REL	relative pronoun		
SCVB	simple/simultaneous converb (adverbial participle)	UNPI	universal negative polarity item (= ca. *"nothing"*)
SEM	suffix deriving semelfactive verb	UQ	universal quantifier
		VBL	verbalizer (derivational) affix
SG	singular		
SPR	*leg-*, superlative prefix	VRB	verbal derivational affix
SUB	sublative case	v.i.	intransitive verb
SUBJ	subjunctive	v.t.	transitive verb
SUP	superessive case		

Orthographic and Phonemic Correspondences

VOWELS

Orthographic	Phonemic (see section 3.1.2.2)
a	/ɔ/
á	/aː/
e	/ɛ/
é	/eː/
i	/i/
í	/iː/
o	/o/
ó	/oː/
ö	/ø/
ő	/øː/
u	/u/
ú	/uː/
ü	/y/
ű	/yː/

CONSONANTS

Orthographic		Phonemic (see section 3.1.2.1)
Short	Geminate	
b	bb	/b/
c	cc	/tʃ/
cs	ccs	/č/
d	dd	/d/
dz	ddz	/dʒ/
dzs	—	/ĵ/
f	ff	/f/
g	gg	/g/
gy	ggy	/ɟ/
h	hh	/h/

Orthographic   *Phonemic* (see section 3.1.2.1)

Short   *Geminate*

Short	Geminate	Phonemic
j	jj	/j/
k	kk	/k/
l	ll	/l/
ly	lly	/j/
m	mm	/m/
n	nn	/n/
ny	nny	/ñ/
p	pp	/p/
q	—	/k/ (in foreign words only)
r	rr	/r/
s	ss	/š/
sz	ssz	/s/
t	tt	/t/
ty	tty	/c/
v	vv	/v/
w	—	/v/ (in foreign words only)
x	—	/ks̸/ (in foreign words only)
y	—	/j/ (in foreign words only)
z	zz	/z/
zs	zzs	/ž/

Introduction

Hungarian is a Finno-Ugric language spoken mostly in and around Hungary by about 14–15 million people. Since the Magyar tribes came to occupy the Carpathian basin in the ninth century, the language has been present in this geographical area. It is the official language of the Republic of Hungary (population 10.1 million), and is used by minority speakers mostly in the Transylvanian region, but also in the lowlands as well as in the Moldavian region in Romania (ca. 1.6 million), along the southern borders of Slovakia (ca. 600,000), in the northern Vojvodina province of Yugoslavia (ca. 400,000), in the Transcarpathian region of Ukraine (ca. 160,000), in Croatia (ca. 30,000), in Slovenia (ca. 10,000), and the eastern province of Burgenland in Austria (ca. 35,000). In addition, there are immigrant communities in the western hemisphere (ca. 1 million), partly as a result of large-scale emigration – around the turn of the century to the United States, and during and after World War II, as well as after the 1956 revolution – to the USA, Canada, Australia, to Israel (ca. 200,000), and to several countries in Western Europe (ca. 250,000).

Hungarian is a remarkably uniform language as far as its dialects are concerned: there are practically no dialects that are not mutually intelligible to any of the others, although differences in pronunciation, morphology, vocabulary, and even syntax are sometimes remarkable. The main dialects are (from east to west): the Csángó (in eastern Romania), the Sicule (or székely in Transylvania), the Lowlands (mezőségi in northwestern Romania), the North-Eastern, the Tisza (around Szeged), the Northern (in and just south of Eastern Slovakia), the Southern (in southern Transdanubia), the Transdanubian, and the Western (along the border with Austria).

The first charters written in part in Hungarian came down from the mid-eleventh century, while the first text, the "Sermon over the Sepulchre", dates from 1211. Grammars were written as early as the seventeenth century and, following the foundation of the Academy of Sciences in 1828, historical and later descriptive studies of the language were published in large numbers. Linguists like Johannis Sajnovics,

who discovered the relationship between Finno-Ugric languages before Sir William Jones's famous lecture on Sanskrit; Antal Reguly, Bernát Munkácsy, Joseph Budenz, who carried out research into the historical origins of the language; and Sámuel Brassai, János Fogarasi, József Szinnyei and Zsigmond Simonyi, whose work included extensive grammars and studies of the nature of the grammatical system of Hungarian.

In this grammar, much in accordance with others in this series, no comparisons with other languages are made, for example, to show whether they do or do not have the property or structure in question. All examples are given according to current orthography, except for forms where the affixes are connected with a hyphen. The phonetic values of the letters and letter combinations are given in the front material.

We have tried to represent what is best termed as "Standard Literary Hungarian", although we did not hesitate to include the usage of "Educated Colloquial Hungarian", mainly the language spoken in Budapest, the capital of the country, with about two million inhabitants. While we hope to have managed to steer clear of prescriptive issues, some have had to be tackled, especially if we judged the form in question to be grammatical, i.e., possible and actually used by speakers, but indeed nonstandard, as against one that was of questionable acceptability or used only in some dialect. Mention has also been made of forms no longer (widely) used, but understood by all speakers.

Since Hungarian is a language making extensive use of a syntactic position reserved for contrastive focus, whenever such a construction is relevant, the focussed item is highlighted by **bold type**. In addition, since the distinction between definite and indefinite objective conjugation is again relevant, the inflection is glossed as "DEF" whenever the verb is in definite conjugation. If the verb is in the indefinite conjugation, its inflection is glossed as "INDEF", or is sometimes not glossed – in the latter cases it should be understood to be in the indefinite conjugation by default.

No extensive references are given. Only major works or works used as sources are mentioned, since it would be impossible to do full justice to the entire literature on the grammar, vocabulary and phonology of Hungarian.

The individual chapters were written by the following authors: the chapters on syntax, ideophones and interjections, and the lexicon by István Kenesei (plus the section on derivational morphology); the chapter on phonology by Robert M. Vago; and the section on inflectional morphology by Anna Fenyvesi.

Finally, we wish to express our thanks and gratitude to all those who have helped us bring the work to this stage: to András Komlósy and Ádám Nádasdy, who read a previous version of the syntax chapter and the derivational morphology section thoroughly, helped eradicate a number of errors of judgment and description, called attention to possible

Chapter 1

Syntax

1.1. GENERAL QUESTIONS

1.1.1. Sentence-types

1.1.1.1. *Direct and quoted speech*

There is no difference between direct and quoted speech; no quotative mood exists in the language, and, except for the somewhat archaic or literary *úgymond* 'thus speaks', there is no marker of quoted statements.

(1)   Péter, úgymond,   beteg volt.
         Peter thus-speaks sick   was
         'It is said that Peter was sick.'

Moreover, except for the predictable changes in reference, there are no structural differences between direct and indirect speech as regards word order, modality or tense, as will be seen in 1.1.2.2–5 below.

1.1.1.2. *Interrogative sentences*

The two main question-types, question-word and yes–no questions, are differentiated by intonation, word-order, and the specific interrogative elements (question-word versus clitic) used, each discussed in turn below.

1.1.1.2.1. Yes–no questions

Yes–no questions have a characteristic rising–falling, i.e., low–high–low, intonation pattern, within which the first syllable of the question is low, the penultimate is the last one bearing high, and the last syllable of the question is low – if it has at least three syllables. If the question does not consist of more than two syllables, the final low may be omitted. For more, see 3.3.4.1 and Varga (1994).

1.1.1.2.1.1. Neutral   The order of constituents in a neutral yes–no question does not differ from that seen in noninterrogatives, and it is a possible strategy – in fact, the most frequent strategy – to ask yes–no questions purely by changing the intonation in the manner described above.

(2) a.   Péter beteg volt.
          Peter sick   was
          'Peter was sick.'

   b.   Péter beteg volt?
          'Was Peter sick?'

In main clause yes–no questions it is possible to apply the clitic -*e* (marked by "Q" below), which is attached to the finite verb in Standard Literary Hungarian. The intonation is falling, i.e., the same as in declarative sentences. The meaning is not quite the same as in the simple intonational question, which qualifies as a common inquiry; the -*e* clitic in main clause questions presupposes some common ground or appears as drawing and ascertaining some inference. (The hyphen between the clitic and the verb is required by the rules of Hungarian orthography. Note that in general only the definite conjugation is glossed, the indefinite conjugation being the null case in most instances.)

(3) a.   Péter beteg volt-e?
          Peter sick   was-Q
          'Was Peter (indeed) sick?'

   b.   Anna Szeged-en   dolgoz-ik-e?
          Anna Szeged-SUP work-3SG-Q
          'Does Anna (really) work in Szeged?'

Adjunction of the clitic to the negation word or the preverbal prefix (= PFX) immediately in front of the finite verb is widespread, though ostracized by purists. In both pairs of examples below, the standard forms are given under (a), then the nonstandard ones under (b), marked by the "%" sign.

(4) a.   Péter nem volt-e beteg?
          Peter not   was-Q sick.

   b.   %Péter nem-e volt beteg?
          'Wasn't Peter sick?'

(5) a.   Anna meg-talál-t-a-e   a   válasz-t?
          Anna PFX-find-PAST-3SG.DEF-Q the answer-ACC

   b.   %Anna meg-e találta a választ?
          'Has Anna found the answer?'

The interrogative expletive *vajon* can occur optionally in both yes–no and question-word questions, with the slight meaning change that, if unaccompanied by the *-e* clitic, it carries less the meaning of an inquiry to another interlocutor than a question addressed to oneself. The presence of *vajon* does not change the intonation of the sentence determined by independent factors: falling in question-word questions and in yes–no questions containing *-e*, rising–falling in all other yes–no questions.

(6) a. Vajon Anna megtalálta(-e) a választ?

  b. Anna vajon megtalálta(-e) a választ?

  c. Anna megtalálta(-e) vajon a választ?

  d. Anna megtalálta(-e) a választ vajon?
   'Has Anna found the answer?'

1.1.1.2.1.2. Leading Leading questions have no special structural characteristics; they contain the 'tag' *ugye* related to a combination of an adverbial and the question clitic: *úgy-e?* 'is it so?', originally appended to the end of a statement to elicit agreement. In current Hungarian, however, it can occur in any position in the sentence, whether it is positive or negative. Note that the question clitic cannot be used concurrently with *ugye*.

(7) a. Ugye Anna meg-találta   a   választ?
   TAG Anna PFX-found.DEF the answer.ACC

  b. Anna ugye megtalálta a választ?

  c. Anna megtalálta ugye a választ?

  d. Anna megtalálta a választ, ugye?
   'Anna has found the answer, hasn't she?'

(8) a. Ugye Anna nem találta   meg a   választ?
   TAG Anna not found.DEF PFX the answer.ACC

  b. Anna nem találta meg a választ, ugye?
   'Anna hasn't found the answer, has she?'

As indicated by the difference in punctuation, it is in the last example that the tag *ugye* indeed behaves as a tag: the statement has its characteristic falling intonation, while the tag has rise or rise–fall as in yes–no questions. In all the other examples, which have a regular yes–no question intonation, it is more like the optional question-word *vajon* 'whether' introduced in the previous section, although *vajon* is not used to induce agreement on the part of the listener.

In other strategies the sentence-final *ugye* can be replaced by *nem?* '(is it) not', *igaz* '(is it) true?', *nem igaz?* '(is it) not true?', or other expressions to the same effect.

1.1.1.2.1.3. Alternative The most common form of alternative questions consists of a positive first clause (with or without the question clitic), the conjunction *vagy* 'or' and what is an elliptic second clause: the negation word *nem* 'not' or, less frequently, *sem* 'neither'. It is always possible to use the more complete, nonelliptic version, which includes the finite verb (and/or whatever is focussed, see example (b); for more on focus, see 1.11). Note that while the question clitic is possible in the elliptic version, it is generally not acceptable in the full alternative question.

(9) a.   Anna meg-találta(-e)   a   választ vagy nem?
        Anna PFX-found-DEF-Q the answer or   not
        'Did Anna find the answer or not?'

    b.   Péter beteg volt(-e) vagy sem?
        Peter sick   was-Q or   not
        'Was Peter sick or not?'

(10) a.   Anna meg-találta (?*-e) a választ vagy nem találta meg?
        'Did Anna find the answer or did she not find it?'

    b.   Péter beteg volt vagy nem volt *(beteg)?
        'Was Peter sick or was he not sick?'

Whereas it is, in principle, not unacceptable to repeat all the constituents of the first clause in the second one, it sounds unusually verbose and unnecessarily tautological. Note that the intonation of the alternative questions shows a rise (characteristic of "comma" intonation) over the first clause and a fall over the second one, thus demonstrating the correspondence between alternative questions and simple yes–no questions, whose identical intonation pattern is "compressed", as it were, over a single clause. Although a gradual descent is also viable, it is impossible to have a rise–fall pattern within the first clause of an alternative question.

   Positive alternatives are also possible in this type of question.

(11) a.   Péter beteg volt vagy egészséges?
        Peter sick   was or   healthy
        'Was Peter sick or healthy?'

    b.   Anna megtalálta   a   választ   vagy meg-buk-ott?
        Anna PFX.found.DEF the answer.ACC or PFX-flunk-PAST
        'Did Anna find the answer or did she flunk?'

1.1.1.2.2. Question-word questions

By way of introduction, the most conspicuous property of this question-type is the movement of (the phrase containing) the question-word into a position immediately in front of the finite verb (though not necessarily into a clause-initial position) in both main and dependent clauses. The issue will be discussed in more detail in 1.1.1.2.2.2. They are also set apart from yes–no and echo-questions by a falling intonation pattern. Although *vajon* 'whether' can be freely used, the clitic *-e* is not allowed. (But recall 1.1.1.2.1.1 for the gloss on *vajon*.)

(12)   Anna (vajon)   mit   talált(*-e) meg?
        Anna whether what.ACC found-Q PFX
        'What did Anna find?'

1.1.1.2.2.1. Elements questioned

1.1.1.2.2.1.1. Constituents of the main clause   Any case-marked constituent of the main clause can be questioned since the case paradigm is generally available to the question-words.

(13)   Ki/ki-nek/mi-ben/mi-hez/mi-vel . . .   találta
        who/who-DAT/what-INE/what-ADE/what-INS found.DEF

        meg a   választ?
        PFX the answer.ACC
        'Who/For whom/In what/For what/With what . . . (did she)
        find/found the answer?'

NPs in semantically more restricted cases, however, cannot be questioned, just like certain postpositional phrases to be seen below. That includes standards of comparisons introduced by the complementizer-like *mint* 'as, than'. But since there is another comparative strategy available, which makes use of a case-marked NP, there is no "syntactic gap" at this point.

(14) a.   Anna gyerek-estül   jött.
          Anna child-together.with came
          'Anna came with (her) child(ren).'

     b.   Péter angol-ul   beszélt.
          Peter English-in spoke
          'Peter spoke in English.'

(15) a.   *Anna   ki/mi-stül jött?
          who/what

    b.   *Péter mi/milyen-ül   beszélt?
                  what/what.like

(16) a.   Péter beteg-ebb   volt mint Anna
           Peter sick-COMP was than Anna
           'Peter was more sick than Anna.'

    b.   *Péter mint ki volt betegebb?

(17) a.   Péter betegebb volt Anná-nál
                           Anna-ADE
           'Peter was more sick than Anna.'

    b.   Péter ki-nél volt betegebb?
           'Who was Peter more sick than?'

Other constituents of the main clause, traditionally classified as adverbials, can also be questioned by means of an array of question-words, such as *hol* 'where', *honnan* 'where from', *hová* 'where to', *hogyan* 'how', *miért* 'why', *hányszor* 'how many times', etc. For more on interrogative pronouns, see 2.1.2.6.

    Finally, the (agentive) predicate can be questioned by the predictable construction *mit csinál?* 'what do.3SG? = what is s/he doing?'

1.1.1.2.2.1.2. Constituents of the subordinate clause Question-words in finite argument clauses of the class of verbs that allow the constituents of their complement clauses to move into the main clause (i.e., 'bridge verbs') can be raised into the main clause. Since the order of constituents is relatively free, there is no difference between the availability of constituents for questions. Note, however, that raised question-words for embedded subjects undergo a "case change" from nominative to accusative.

(18) a.   Mikor-ra   akar-od,   hogy Anna meg-talál-j-a   a
           when-SUB want-DEF.2SG that Anna PFX-find-SUBJ-DEF the

           választ?
           answer.ACC
           '(By) when do you want Anna to find the answer?'

    b.   Péter mit   akar,   hogy Anna meg-talál-j-on?
           Peter what.ACC want.3SG that Anna PFX-find.-SUBJ-3SG
           'What does Peter want Anna to find?'

    c.   Péter ki-t   akar,   hogy első-nek ér-j-en
        Peter who-ACC want.3SG that   first-DAT reach-SUBJ-3SG

        ide?
        here
        'Who does Peter want to arrive here first?'

Infinitival clauses allow any of their constituents to be questioned, since their constituents can in most cases be freely dispersed in main clauses. The question-words are again placed in front of the inflected verb in the main clause.

(19)   Ki/ki-nek/mi-ben/mi-hez/mi-vel/hol/hogyan . . .
        who/who-DAT/what-INE/what-ADE/what-INS/where/how

        akar-t-a   meg-talál-ni a   választ?
        want-PAST-DEF.3SG PFX-find-INF the answer
        'Who/For whom/In what/For what/With what/Where/ How/ . . . (did she) want(ed) to find the answer?'

1.1.1.2.2.1.3. Constituents of the noun phrase   Various constituents in noun phrases can be questioned by (i) moving the entire noun phrase in front of the finite verb, a case of pied-piping.

(20) a.   Milyen/Hány   választ   talált meg Anna?
        what/how.many answer.ACC found PFX Anna
        'What/How many answer(s) did Anna find?'

    b.   A [ki által adott] választ   találta   meg Anna?
        the who by   given answer.ACC found.DEF PFX Anna
        'The answer given by whom did Anna find?' = ca. 'Whose answer did Anna find?'

    c.   [Ki által adott] válaszokat   talált Anna?
        who by   given answers.ACC found Anna
        'Answers given by whom did Anna find?' = ca. 'What answers did Anna find?' [Reply with respect to names of persons that gave the answers in question.]

Note that (20c) is perfectly acceptable in Hungarian as a "plain" question-word question, although its English gloss is downright ungrammatical.

   The "questionable" constituents of NPs include demonstrative, numeral, and various adjectival phrases with a wide range of semantic options referring to size, quality, etc. (cf. 1.2.5.2).

(21)   Melyik/Milyen/Mennyi/Mekkora/Milyen jó ... választ
        which/what/how.many/how.big/how good   answer

        talált(a)   Anna?
        found(DEF) Anna
        'Which/What/How many/How big/How good ... answer(s)
        did Anna find?'

(ii) Question-words in the possessor position in NPs can move (a) the entire NP into preverbal position, (b) or move out of the possessive NP into the preverbal position, leaving the rest of the NP behind. Note that possessed nominals can also be questioned, whether (c) as a whole or (d) some parts thereof. (For more on possessive NPs, see below in 1.10.)

(22) a.   [Ki-nek   a   kulcs-á-t]   találta   meg Anna?
          who-DAT the key-POSS.3SG-ACC found.DEF PFX Anna
          'Whose key did Anna find?'

    b.   [Ki-nek] találta meg Anna [a kulcs-á-t]
          'Whose key did Anna find?'

    c.   Anná-nak mi-jé-t   találta   meg Péter?
          Anna-DAT what-POSS.3SG-ACC found.DEF PFX Peter
          'What of Anna's (= What that belongs to Anna) did Peter find?'

    d.   Anná-nak melyik kulcs-á-t   találta   meg Péter?
          Anna-DAT which key-POSS.3SG-ACC found.DEF PFX Peter
          'Which key of Anna's did Peter find?'

1.1.1.2.2.1.4. Constituents of the postpositional phrase   Postpositional phrases all contain NPs, and all that was said in the previous section on NPs holds for these PPs as well. PPs have two subtypes: one that assigns (oblique) case to its NP, the other that does not; both allow pied-piping, however – at least in some dialects. Some speakers accept the latter type when separated only if the meaning is metaphorical (see (23d) below). In this case the construction becomes similar to a possessive noun phrase in that the dative-marked object of postposition is related to the possessive-marked postposition left behind.

(23) a.   [Melyik fiú-val   együtt] jött Anna?
          which   boy-INS together came Anna
          'With which boy did Anna come?'

    b.   %[Melyik fiú-val] jött együtt Anna?

    c.   [Mekkora fiú mögött] áll   Anna?
          what.size boy behind stands Anna
          'Behind a boy of what size is Anna standing?'

    d.   [Mekkora fiú-nak]   áll   Anna mögött-e?
        what.size boy-DAT stands Anna behind-POSS
        'Who is Anna standing behind (= support)?'

Some semantically restricted postpositional phrases, just like their case-marked counterparts, cannot be questioned.

(24) a.   Péter elnök   gyanánt viselkedett.
         Peter chairman like   behaved
         'Peter behaved like a chairman.'

     b.   *Péter mi   gyanánt viselkedett?
              what like

1.1.1.2.2.1.5. Constituents of coordinate structures   Constituents of coordinate structures cannot be questioned in genuine questions, in distinction to echo-questions, which allow one of their elements to be a question-word (see below).

1.1.1.2.2.1.6. Multiple question-words   Multiple question-words are possible in Hungarian in three arrangements.

    (i) They can all be lined up in front of the finite verb with no restriction on their relative order as to grammatical functions, but there is a preference for more specific question-words to be placed in front of less specific ones. Note that the series of question-words (or phrases containing them) cannot be interrupted by a phrase not containing one.

(25) a.   Ki   mi-t   hol   talált meg?
         who what-ACC where found PFX
         'Who found what where?'

     b.   (?) Mit hol ki talált meg?

     c.   *Hol Anna mit talált meg?

    (ii) If the frame of reference of the multiple question is not unlimited, but is some specific domain – such as the events within a movie or a novel – it is possible for only one of the question-words to be placed preverbally with the rest of them left in postverbal positions. There is also a difference of interpretation accompanying the structural difference. In the standard case the pairs (or n-tuples) of individuals satisfying the variables in the question-words are, in some sense, unrestricted; in the case where only one of the question-words moves, the question concerns a specific pair (or n-tuple) of individuals that constitute the satisfactory answer (cf. É. Kiss 1994).

(26) a.   A mesében ki   ki-t   talált meg?
          the story-INE who who-ACC found PFX

     b.   A mesében ki talált meg ki-t?
          'Who found who in the story?'

   (iii) The somewhat uninteresting type of multiple question in which the question-words are in a coordinate construction is also possible. In this case the answer is expected to be similarly coordinated and not a list of paired items. Note that the conjoined second question-word can also be placed clause-finally.

(27) a.   A: Ki   és   hol   találta   meg a   választ?
              who and where found.DEF PFX the answer

     b.   A: Ki találta meg a választ és hol?
              'Who found the answer and where?'

     c.   B: Péter és   egy könyv-ben (találta meg a választ).
              Peter and a   book-INE
              'Peter found it and (he found it) in a book.'

1.1.1.2.2.2. The position of question-words   Question-words (or the phrases containing them) must be placed immediately to the left of the finite verb, a position generally identified with focus. Characteristically, preverbal question-words, in effect, remove verbal prefixes from the usual place they occupy in neutral sentences. The only exception to the adjacency of the question-word and the inflected verb is when the verb is negated, in which case the negation word is interpolated between the question-word (and, in general, the usual focus site) and the finite verb. (For more on focus, see 1.11.)

(28) a.   Hol   talál-t-a   meg Anna a   választ?
          where found-PAST-DEF.3SG PFX Anna the answer.ACC
          'Where did Anna find the answer?'

     b.   *Hol meg-találta Anna a választ?

     c.   Ki   nem találta meg a választ?
          who not
          'Who did not find the answer?'

In infinitival clauses, however, the cooccurrence of what is formally a question-word and the prefix in front of the verb is not ruled ungrammatical, but the resulting meaning is not one of a subordinate question but that of a negative clause. The backshifted prefix, on the other hand, preserves the interrogative sense, though the construction does not appear to be productive.

(29) a.   Nem tud-om   [hol   el-rejte-ni   a   választ]
          not   know-DEF.1SG where PFX-hide-INF the answer.ACC
          'I can't hide the answer anywhere.'

    b.   Nem tudom [hol talál-ni meg a választ]
          'I don't know where to find the answer.'

As was illustrated above, the preverbal position of question-words is not necessarily an initial one. Since, except for the question-word–finite verb adjacency requirement, the order of constituents is free, any (or all) other elements can be placed preverbally or postverbally, all other things being equal, without any relevant meaning difference.

(30) a.   Tegnap   Anna a   kulcsot   hol   találta   meg?
          yesterday Anna the key.ACC where found.DEF PFX
          'Where did Anna find the key yesterday?'

    b.   Hol találta meg tegnap a kulcsot Anna?
          'Where did Anna find the key yesterday?'

The only additional ordering requirement this question-type has to observe consists in the prohibition against preposing any quantifiers in front of (the phrase containing) the question-word. Note that *senki* is a so-called negative polarity item, which requires clausemate negation of the predicate, indicated by the negative in parentheses below.

(31) a.   *Mindenki/Senki/Sok   ember mit   (nem) talált?
          everyone/no one/many people what.ACC not   found

    b.   Mit talált mindenki/sok ember?
          'What did everyone/many people find?'

    c.   Mit nem talált senki sem?
          'What did no one find?'

1.1.1.2.3. Echo-questions

All echo-questions, whether yes–no or question-word echo-questions, are characterized by a rise–fall, i.e., general yes–no question, intonation pattern – usually distributed onto each major constituent.

1.1.1.2.3.1. Yes–no echo-questions   Yes–no echo-questions have no special properties; they repeat all or part of the statement made by the speaker, including the focus if any, with the predictable changes in deixis. In echo-questions of neutral statements no adjunct may be included unless arguments are also present, as illustrated by the multiple parentheses below. Note that, although a different order of constituents is

possible in the statement, arguments still have priority of occurrence over adjuncts in the echo-question.

(32) a.   A: Megtaláltam   a   választ a   kérdésére
                found.DEF.1SG the answer the his.question.SUB

               tegnap.
               yesterday
               'I found the answer to his question yesterday.'

     b.   B: Megtaláltad   (a választ (a kérdésére (tegnap)))?
               found.DEF.2SG
               'You found it?/You found the answer (to his question
               (yesterday))?'

In echo-questions to focussed statements the focus has to be repeated. Only if it stands by itself can the focussed constituent have the question clitic attached to it. This last version can convey an indication of disbelief. (Focus here and throughout is marked by bold type.)

(33) a.   A: **Tegnap** találtam   meg a választ a kérdésére.
                          found.DEF.1SG PFX
               'I found the answer to his question **yesterday**.'

     b.   B: **Tegnap** (találtad meg (a választ (a kérdésére)))?
               '(You found it/the answer (to his question)) **yesterday**?'

     c.   B: **Tegnap**-e (*találtad meg . . .)?
               'So it was yesterday, wasn't it?'

1.1.1.2.3.2. Question-word echo-questions   Question-word echo-questions are like genuine question-word questions; that is, all question-words have to be placed preverbally, except that their intonation is that of yes–no questions, and they can optionally be introduced by the general tensed subordinate complementizer *hogy* 'that'.

(34) a.   A: Anna megtalálta   a   választ.
               Anna PFX.found.DEF the answer.ACC
               'Anna found the answer.'

     b.   B: (Hogy) Anna **mit**   talált   meg?
               that   Anna what.ACC found PFX
               'Anna found what?'

(35) a.   A: Anna mikor találta meg a választ?
                          when
               'When did Anna find the answer?'

b.   B: (Hogy) Anna **mit** mikor talált meg?
'When did Anna find what?'

The optional focal stress on the question-words is represented by bold type in the above examples.

Question-word echo-questions show a greater liberty in the range of questionable constituents embedded in NPs than genuine question-word questions. Note again that the only difference between an echo and a genuine question interpretation is in the intonation, though we will mark echo-questions also by highlighting the question-word in bold.

(36) a.   *Echo*
Anna [a **[hol**   olvasó] fiú-k-at]   látta?
Anna the where reading boy-PL-ACC saw.DEF.3SG
'Anna saw the boys reading where?'

b.   *Genuine*
*Anna [a hol olvasó fiúkat] látta?

This property of question-word echo-questions associates them closer with focussed structures than with genuine question-word questions, since the positions accessible for such echo-questions are all available to focussing too. Note that indefinite (or, more exactly, nonspecific) NPs allow genuine question-words in the same position ruled out in definite NPs. (Of course these questions can have echo-question readings as well. For answers, see below in 1.1.1.2.4.1.2.)

(37)   *Genuine*
Anna [[hol   olvasó] fiú-k-at]   látott?
Anna where reading boy-PL-ACC saw.3SG
'For what place x, did Anna see boys reading at x?'

1.1.1.2.3.3. Yes–no question echo-questions   Yes–no question echo-questions repeat the speaker's question usually prefixed with the complementizer *hogy* 'that' and using the obligatory question clitic *-e*.

(38) a.   A: Be-mész   az iskolá-ba?
PFX-go.2SG the school-ILL
'Are you going in the school?'

b.   B: (Hogy) Be-megyek *(-e) az iskolá-ba?
that   PFX-go.1SG -Q   the school-ILL
'Am I going in the school?'

1.1.1.2.3.4. Question-word question echo-questions   Question-word question echo-questions again can make use of the complementizer *hogy* and they are also differentiated from their genuine question counterparts

by a rising–falling intonation pattern. Similarly to genuine question-word questions, the use of the clitic -e is prohibited here.

(39) a.   A: Hová mész?
                 where go.2SG
                 'Where are you going?'

     b.   B: (Hogy) Hová megyek?
                 that   where go.1SG
                 'Where am I going?'

1.1.1.2.3.5. Restrictions on echo-questions   Restrictions on echo-questions are less extensive than those on genuine questions. It follows from the foregoing that all elements that can be questioned by genuine question-word questions can be subject to echo-questioning as well. No question-word can, however, remain inside tensed clauses, and when they cannot be extracted for independent reasons the structures are ungrammatical, whether they are genuine or echo-questions. (The extraction site is marked by *t*.)

(40) a.   Anna megtalálta   [azt az embert   [aki Pétert
           Anna PFX.found.DEF that the man.ACC who Peter.ACC

           látt-a]]
           saw-DEF.3SG
           'Anna has found the man who saw Peter.'

     b.   *Anna kit   talált meg [azt az embert [aki *t* látott/látta]]
                 who.ACC found PFX   saw.INDEF/DEF
            '*Who did Anna find the man who saw?'

     c.   *Anna [azt az embert [aki **kit** látott]] talált meg?
            'Anna has found the man who saw who?'

Thus both the genuine and the echo-question are unacceptable if the question-word that has main clause scope is inside the relative, or for that matter, the complement clause.

1.1.1.2.3.6. Multiple echo-questions   Multiple echo-questions have the same form as question-word echo-questions discussed in 1.1.1.2.3.2, except that all question-words are equally stressed. The illustration below makes use of a focussed statement, which is a better basis for a multiple echo-question than a neutral one. The only difference between this one and a corresponding genuine multiple question lies in the intonation.

(41) a.   A: Anna a   kulcsot **tegnap**   találta   meg
                 Anna the key.ACC yesterday found.DEF PFX
                 'Anna found the key **yesterday**.'

b.   B: Ki   mit   **mikor** talált   meg?
           who what.ACC when   found PFX
           'Who found what when?'

It is possible also in case of echo-questions to leave one or more question-words in postverbal position(s). In this case the echo-question conveys a sense of disagreement or disbelief. Note that the rise–fall pattern distributed over the final two syllables above is compressed onto the single syllable of the accented question-word below.

(42) a.   A: Anna megtalálta   Pétert.
            Anna PFX.found.DEF Peter.ACC
            'Anna found Peter.'

     b.   B: (Hogy) **ki**   talált   meg **kit**?
            that   who found PFX who.ACC
            'Who found who?'

1.1.1.2.3.7. The behavior of different questioned elements   Different questioned elements do not behave in a way distinct from genuine question-word questions, see 1.1.1.2.2.1.

1.1.1.2.4. Answers

1.1.1.2.4.1. Answers and speech acts   Answers are not marked as distinct speech acts.

1.1.1.2.4.1.1. Answers to yes–no questions   Answers to yes–no questions can always be a simple *igen* 'yes' or *nem* 'no'. (See also below in 1.1.1.2.4.2.)

    In addition to these minimal answers, there are various options depending on the structure of the question. An answer may repeat (i) the focussed constituent if any, whether in its original form or as a coreferential pronominal. The minimal answers *igen* and *nem* are illustrated only in this subgroup, but they are possible alternatives all through.

(43) a.   A: Anna **a**   **kulcsot**   találta   meg?
            Anna the key.ACC found.DEF PFX
            'Did Anna find **the key**?'

     b.   B: **A kulcsot.**

     c.   B: **Azt.**
            it.ACC
            'Yes, she did/found it.'

  d.   B: Igen.
            'yes'

(43) e.   B: Nem.
               'no'

  (ii) The verbal prefix can also be repeated:

(44) a.   A: Anna **meg**-találta a kulcsot?

  b.   B: **Meg**.
            'She has.'

  (iii) If any, the verbal modifier (noun with no article, simple adjective, adverbial, etc.) is repeated, possibly in a pronominal version as an alternative. For more on verbal modifiers, see 1.2.1.2.6.

(45) a.   A: Anna **könyv-et**   olvas?
               Anna book-ACC reads
               'Is Anna reading a book?'

  b.   B: **Könyvet**.
            book.ACC
            'Yes/She is.'

  c.   B: **Azt**.
            it.ACC

(46) a.   A: Péter **beteg** volt?
               Peter sick   was
               'Was Peter sick?'

  b.   B: **Beteg**.
            'sick'

  c.   B: **Az**.
            'it'

(47) a.   A: Anna **jól**   érzi   magát?
               Anna well feels herself.ACC
               'Is Anna feeling well?'

  b.   B: **Jól**.
            'well'

(48) a.   A: Péter **haza**-ment?
               Peter home-went
               'Has Peter gone home?'

b. B: **Haza**.
'home'

(iv) If, finally, none of the above is present, the finite verb is repeated in answer to the yes–no question.

(49) a. A: Anna **talált** érdekes könyveket tegnap a
Anna found interesting books.ACC yesterday the

bolt-ban?
shop-INE
'Did Anna find interesting books in the shop yesterday?'

b. B: **Talált**.
found.3SG
'She did.'

c. B: *Anna talált tegnap.

d. B: *Talált érdekes könyveket tegnap a boltban.

e. B: Anna **talált** érdekes könyveket tegnap a bolt-ban
'Anna found interesting books in the shop yesterday.'

As is indicated by the bold type, in cases (ii)–(iv) above it is also the focussed constituent that is repeated in the answer, suggesting that whenever no other constituent of the clause is focussed, the prefix, the verbal modifier, or, in their absence, the finite verb itself is emphasized in yes–no questions.

Whereas the rest of the question can be repeated in each case above without making the answer totally unacceptable, it is the entire sentence (or the sentence without the topic constituent(s) placed to the left of the focus) that has to reoccur in the answer, though it always sounds awkward or tautological. Note that in yes–no questions no pro-drop of the subject or the object is possible, thus a "truncated" answer, as in the (c) or (d) examples above, is unacceptable – in contrast with what is discussed directly below.

1.1.1.2.4.1.2. Answers to question-word questions Answers to question-word questions generally consist of the constituent that satisfies the question-word. It is again technically possible to give a "full answer" with the caveat above, and then the answer follows the structure of the question. That is, since question-words are placed preverbally, the corresponding constituents in answers must occur in the same preverbal position, otherwise the answer will be ungrammatical.

(50) a.   A: Anna **mit**   talált?
                Anna what.ACC found
                'What did Anna find?'

     b.   B: **Kulcsot.**
                key.ACC
                'A key.'

     c.   B: Anna **kulcsot** talált.
                'Anna found a key.'

     d.   B: *Anna talált kulcsot.

Repeating the initial, i.e., pre-focus, constituent, as in examples (e) and (f) below, can yield some kind of multiple contrast to be discussed in 1.12. Note, however, that Hungarian is a "pro-drop" language; thus subjects (as well as singular definite objects) can be omitted under identity. Also note the curious case of the unacceptable (d) sentence, and example (g), in which the order is changed except for the adjacent answer (= focussed) constituent and the verb.

(51) a.   A: A   kulcsot   mikor találta   meg Anna?
                the key.ACC when found.DEF PFX Anna
                'When did Anna find the key?'

     b.   B: Tegnap.
                'yesterday'

     c.   B: Tegnap találta meg.
                'She found it yesterday.'

     d.   B: *Tegnap találta meg Anna.

(51) e.   B: A kulcsot tegnap találta meg.
                'She found the key yesterday.'

(51) f.   B: A kulcsot tegnap találta meg Anna.
                'Anna found the key yesterday.'

(51) g.   B: Anna tegnap találta meg a kulcsot.
                'Anna found the key yesterday.'

   In answer to question-word questions that contain the question-word inside some constituent, the entire constituent in question must in principle be repeated, with the answer proper filling in for the place of the question-word. Since, however, the head noun and the phrases adjoined to it can be omitted, it is often the case that the questioned constituent is given in the answer and it carries the case suffix of the entire NP.

(52) a.   A: Anna milyen kulcsot   talált?
             Anna what   key.ACC found
             'What key did Anna find?'

    b.   B: Hosszú kulcs-ot.
             long   key-ACC

    c.   B: Hosszú-t.
             long-ACC
             'A long one.'

(53) a.   A: Anna hány   hosszú kulcs-ot   talált?
                  how.many long   key-ACC
             'How many long keys did Anna find?'

    b.   B: Négy hosszú kulcs-ot.
             four   long   key-ACC.
             'Four long keys.'

    c.   B: *Négy hosszú-t.

    d.   B: Négy-et.
             four-ACC
             'Four ones.'

In answer to questions containing question-words embedded in prenomi-
nal (nonfinite) clauses, the entire nonfinite clause has to be repeated,
though the head noun can be omitted again, cf. 1.1.1.2.3.1.

(54) a.   A: Anna [[hol   olvasó] fiú-k-at]   látott?
             Anna where reading boy-PL-ACC saw.3SG
             'For what place x, did Anna see boys reading at x?'

    b.   B: Könyvtár-ban olvasó (fiú)-k-at   (látott).
             library-INE   reading boy-PL-ACC
             '(She saw) boys reading in a library.'

1.1.1.2.4.1.3. Answers to echo-questions Answers to echo-questions fol-
low the pattern established for answers to (genuine) question-word
questions.

1.1.1.2.4.2. Minimal answers to yes–no questions Minimal answers to
positive yes–no questions other than repetitions of elements of the ques-
tion can be given by means of *igen* 'yes', *nem* 'no, not', as well as a number
of other words and expressions, such as *esetleg, talán* 'perhaps', *lehet*
'maybe', *biztos* 'sure, probably', etc.
    Minimal answers to negative yes–no questions are given by *nem* 'no,
not', which means agreement with the negative assertion, or *de igen* 'but

yes', *dehogynem* 'but of course', which convey disagreement with the negative assertion.

(55) a. A: Péter nem volt beteg?
Peter not was sick
'Wasn't Peter sick?'

b. B: Nem, (nem volt beteg)
'No (he wasn't sick).'

c. B: De igen/Dehogynem (beteg volt)
'Yes (he was).'

Minimal answers to question-word questions have been discussed above.

1.1.1.3. Imperative sentences

1.1.1.3.1. The form of the imperative

The imperative form is distinguished by means of an affix -*j*. The imperative marker is, however, not distinct from the subjunctive, leading to much confusion in grammars of Hungarian. Part of the problem is due to the fact that in addition to "primary" imperatives in second person singular and plural, and the secondary, though transparent, first person plural imperative, polite or formal second person (like French *vous*, Italian *Lei*, German *Sie*) is realized in this language by use of third person verb-forms, making the imperative paradigm almost complete. On the other hand, verb-forms essentially identical with the imperative are used in subordination (see below). The subjunctive will be discussed in 1.1.2.2.5.

1.1.1.3.1.1. The uses of the imperative   The imperative affix is -*j*, which assimilates in a number of well-defined cases to the preceding sound. For more on the morphological paradigm, see 2.1.3.4.3. Since Hungarian is a pro-drop language, subject pronouns are not expressed in the default case in imperative sentences either.

(56) a. Másol-j   egy kulcs-ot!
copy-IMP a   key-ACC
'Copy (2SG) a key.'

b. Másol-j-atok   egy kulcsot!
copy-IMP-2PL
'Copy (2PL) a key.'

c. Másol-j-unk   egy kulcsot!
copy-IMP-1PL
'Let's copy a key.'

d. Másol-j-on   egy kulcsot!
    copy-IMP-3SG
    'Copy (2SG, formal/distant) a key.'

e. Másol-j-anak   egy kulcsot!
    copy-IMP-3PL
    'Copy (3PL, formal/distant) a key.'

Although the "missing link" – that is, the first person singular – formally does exist and is used in subordinate sentences, since it is uninterpretable as a main clause, it is simply ungrammatical. The "suggestion" sense of first person imperatives is carried by a special form relying on *hadd* originally meaning 'let, allow (IMP-2SG)'.

(57) a. *Másol-j-ak   egy kulcsot!
          copy-IMP-1SG a   key.ACC

     b. Hadd másol-j-ak egy kulcsot!
         'Let me copy a key.'

Note, however, that the third person forms of the imperative can have a straightforward third person use in the "suggestion" or subjunctive sense.

(58) a. Másol-j-on   Anna egy kulcsot!
          copy-IMP-3SG Anna a   key.ACC
          'Let Anna copy a key.'

     b. Másol-j-anak   a   fiúk egy kulcsot!
         copy-IMP-3PL the boys a   key.ACC
         'Let the boys copy a key.'

1.1.1.3.1.2. Degrees of the imperative   Different degrees of the imperative are available for prefix + verb combinations, in which the position of the prefix is variable according to the force of the imperative. Thus, in second persons the standard or default imperative has the prefix in postverbal position. If, however, the prefix is in its otherwise usual preverbal location, the imperative is understood as a threat and the intonation is rising instead of the fall normal for imperatives.

(59) a. Másol-j le   egy kulcsot!
          copy-IMP PFX a   key.ACC
          'Copy a key.'

     b. Le-másol-j egy kulcsot!
         'Copy a key, or . . .'

In other persons, in particular in the first person singular, this variation carries a different force, since the imperative is out of the question here. If used as an interrogative and the prefix is postverbal, it is a kind of

echo-question to an imperative with an accompanying rising intonation on each major constituent.

(60) a.   A: Másol-j le egy kulcsot!
                 'Copy a key.'

     b.   B: Másol-j-ak   le egy kulcsot?
                 copy-IMP-1SG
                 '(You want me to) copy a key?'

Whether the prefix is placed preverbally or postverbally, the question is understood as an offer, and the intonation shows the usual rise–fall pattern of yes–no questions.

(61) a.   Le-másol-j-ak egy kulcsot?
           'Shall I copy a key?'

     b.   Másol-j-ak le egy kulcsot?
           'Shall I copy the key?'

1.1.1.3.2.1. Negative imperatives   Negative imperatives are formed by placing the imperative/subjunctive version of the negation word *ne* 'not' in front of the inflected verb. For persons available in the negative paradigm, see the positive paradigm in 1.1.1.3.1.1.

(62) a.   Ne másol-j   kulcs-ot!
           not copy-IMP key.ACC
           'Don't copy a key.'

     b.   Ne másol-j-unk   kulcsot!
               copy-IMP-1PL
           'Don't let's copy a key.'

1.1.1.3.2.2. Degrees of negative imperative   Degrees of negative imperative are available according to the pattern seen in positive imperatives, except that the negative element must be different for reasons to be seen directly. *Ne* gives way to *nehogy* (literally, a combination of *ne* and the complementizer *hogy* 'that'). Again, the intonation is rising, indicating the suppressed consequences. Another means is to place the negative word between the prefix and verb.

(63) a.   Nehogy le-másol-d   a   kulcsot!
           not   PFX-copy-IMP.DEF the key.ACC
           ca. 'Don't you copy the key, or . . . '

     b.   Le ne másol-d a kulcsot!
           ca. 'Don't you copy the key, or . . . '

1.1.1.3.3. Further devices of expressing imperative

Other means of expressing imperative force include (a) second person
positive or negative questions, used commonly, for example, by parents
to babies to prevent (further) mishaps; (b) in formal relations by means of
tessék 'lit. please-IMP', (c) *légy szíves* 'be-2SG kind' or *legyen szíves* 'be–3SG
kind' with an infinitival, or (d) a finite, clause. Note that these last two
formulas are no longer seen as constructs but are regarded as single items
by speakers of the language, although orthography still observes their
origins.

(64) a. (Nem) Teszed   le   a   kulcsot?
         not   put.2SG down the key.ACC
         'Don't you put down the key (right away)?'

    b. Tessék le-másol-ni   a   kulcsot.
        please PFX-copy-INF the key.ACC
        'Please, copy the key.'

    c. Légy szíves le-másol-ni a kulcsot.
        'Be so kind   as to copy the key.'

    d. Légy   szíves, másol-j-ad   le a kulcsot.
        be.2SG kind   copy-IMP-2SG.DEF
        'Please, copy the key.'

Note that intonation may be responsible for significant distinctions in
interpreting the same sentence as a command or as a polite request: the
former is always accompanied by a fall on the last stressed item, the latter
by a much more even contour throughout.

1.1.1.3.4. Focus in imperative sentences

Focus in imperatives can arise in three ways: (a) if a constituent is stressed
to the left of an unstressed verb in the imperative form; (b) if the negation
word *ne* 'not' precedes the preverbal focus, and (c) if in imperatives it is
possible for a heavily accented constituent to remain in a postverbal
position; in this last case the meaning the imperative conveys is a strong
suggestion of choosing one rather than another alternative.

(65) a. **A   kulcsot** tegyed   le!
         the key.ACC put.DEF down
         'Put down the **key** (rather than something else)!'

    b. Ne a **kulcsot** tegyed le!
        'Don't put down the **key** (put down something else)!'

c. Tegyed le a **kulcsot**!
    '(Try and) put down the **key**!' = ca. 'Let it be the key that you
    will put down.'

It is in the case of contrastive focus that prefixes, and in general verbal
modifiers (also called "reduced complements"), can be placed and
accented preverbally. The ensuing interpretation involves contrasting the
complex verb or the verbal modifier itself with a specific or open alterna-
tive. In view of the above, this is but a subcase of focus in imperatives.

(66) a. **El-olvas-d**   a   könyvet   (ne csak **nézegesd**)!
         PFX-read-IMP.DEF.2SG the book.ACC (not just look.IMP.it)
         'READ the book (don't just look at it)!'

     b. **Fel**-men-j-él   (ne **le**)!
         up-go-IMP-2SG not down
         'Go up, not down!'

1.1.1.4. *Other sentence-types*

Grammars of Hungarian distinguish two further sentence-types.

1.1.1.4.1. Desideratives

To express desires, the verb in conditional form combines with grammati-
cal formatives (conjunctions, adverbials) used for other functions in other
contexts (e.g., introducing concessive, conditional, or coordinate clauses).
In case of full formal identity the intonation contour reveals the differ-
ence: conditionals have a rising pattern, desires have a gradual descent.

(67) a. Bár/Ha/Bár-ha tud-ná-nak   olvas-ni!
         though/if   know-COND-3PL read-INF
         'If they could read!'

     b. Csak lemásol-t-uk   volna a   kulcsot!
         only PFX.copy-PAST-DEF.1PL COND the key.ACC
         'If only we had found the key!'

Technically speaking, it is here that (literal) third and first person impera-
tive forms belong, thus providing an argument for their more appropriate
classification as a form of subjunctive.

(68) a. Nyíl-j-on   ki az ajtó!
         open-IMP-3SG out the door.NOM
         'Let the door open up!'

b.   Ne lás-s-am   többé a   gyerekeimet   (ha ez
     not see-IMP-DEF.1SG more the my.children.ACC if   this

     nem igaz)!
     not true
     'May I not see my children again (if this isn't true).'

Note that the example for first person is not at all formal, unlike its Eng-
lish translation, which is meant to illustrate the effect of the subjunctive.

1.1.1.4.2. Exclamations

Exclamations can be simple or complex, but all instances must focus on
some quality or quantity; the mere fact or event cannot be the subject of an
exclamation.
    In adjective-focussed exclamations a statement is prefixed by the
exclamatory particles *milyen* 'what', which is apparently identical with
the coordinating conjunction *de* 'but' and has a rising intonation contour.
Note that the optional indefinite article is between the adjective and the
head noun, rather than in its normal position to the left of the adjective.

(69) a.   Milyen/De érdekes   (egy) könyvet   olvasol!
          what/how interesting a   book.ACC read.2SG
          'What an interesting book you're reading!'

     b.   *De olvasol (egy érdekes könyvet)!
          ca. *'How you're reading an interesting book!'

    Predicate-focussed exclamations differ from simple ones by employing
the adverbial question-words *milyen* + adverb 'how', *mennyire* 'how
much', *mit* 'what.ACC', etc., or the simple particle *de* again. In these con-
structions it is required that the prefix precede the verb. (For more on
prefix–verb order, see below.) Recall that in questions prefixes cannot
occur between the question-word and the inflected verb. Excepting those
beginning with *de*, they can all be introduced by the general complemen-
tizer *hogy* 'that'.

(70) a.   (Hogy) mennyire meg-változtál!
          that   how.much PFX-changed.2SG
          'How much you have changed!'

     b.   De meg-változtál!
          'How much you have changed!'

     c.   Hogy meg-változtál!
          'How much you have changed!'

     d.   *Mennyire/De változtál meg!

Another variety is produced by inserting the negation word between the prefix (if any) and the verb. In this case the prefix can also be placed behind the verb. If there is no prefix, the negation element is between the question-word and the verb.

(71) a.   Mit   el   nem olvasott!
            what PFX not read.PAST.3SG
            'How much she has read!'

     b.   Mit nem olvasott el!
            'How much she has read!'

     c.   Mit nem olvasott!
            'How much she has read!'

It is perplexing at first sight that in certain types of exclamations both the prefix–verb and the verb–prefix order are allowed.

(72) a.   Mi   (minden)-t el-olvasott!
            what all-ACC   PFX-read.3SG
            'How much she has read!'

     b.   Mi (minden)-t olvasott el!
            'How much she has read!'

(73) a.   Milyen sok   könyvet   el-olvasott!
            how   many book.ACC
            'How many books she's read!'

     b.   Milyen sok könyvet olvasott el!
            'How many books she's read!'

And it may be even more confusing that some exclamations allow the prefix to occur only postverbally.

(74) a.   (Egy) milyen érdekes   könyvet   olvastam el!
            a   what   interesting book.ACC read.1SG PFX
            'What an interesting book I've (just) read!'

     b.   *Egy/Ø milyen érdekes könyvet el-olvastam!

This difference between the exclamations with prefixes fixed in preverbal and postverbal positions and those with movable prefixes may be due to their relatedness to corresponding quantified structures. The variation in the placement of the prefix ultimately goes back to the focussability (or contrastability) of the preverbal quantifier phrase, cf. also 1.11. For, if it cannot be focussed, the prefix must intervene between it and the verb, otherwise a focus reading would be generated. For comparison, see the

positions of the nonfocussable adverbial *nagyon* and a quantified phrase below in indicative clauses.

(75) a. Nagyon meg-változtál.
much PFX-changed.2SG
'You've changed much.'

b. *Nagyon változtál meg.

(76) a. Sok könyvet olvasott el.
many book read.3SG PFX
'She has read many books.'

b. Sok könyvet el-olvasott.
ca. 'There are many books she has read.'

1.1.1.5. *Indirect speech acts*

In surveying sentences expressing desires it has been noted that they may only be differentiated from conditionals by the intonation contour. Other indirect speech acts include questions used as (a) requests, (b) commands, (c) statements, (d) suggestions, etc. (cf. also 1.1.1.3.3).

(77) a. Le-ten-né-d   a kulcs-ot?
down-put-COND-DEF.2SG the key.ACC
'Would you put down the key?'

b. Miért nem tesz-ed   (már) le   a kulcs-ot?
Why not put-DEF.2SG yet   down the key.ACC
'(Now) why don't you put down the key?'

c. Honnan   tud-j-am,   hol   van a kulcs?
where.from know-IMP-DEF.1SG where is   the key
'How should I know where the key is?'

d. Nem kell-ene   megvárni   Annát?
not need-COND.3SG PFX.wait.INF Anna.ACC
'Shouldn't we wait for Anna?'

1.1.2. Subordination

1.1.2.1. *The marking of subordination*

Subordination is marked by (a) the general or 'neutral' complementizer *hogy* 'that', (b) by a series of 'meaningful' complementizers, such as *ha* 'if', *mint* 'as', *bár* 'although', or (c) by a variety of (phrases containing) relative pronouns.

(78) a.   Anna tudta   az-t,   hogy Péter beteg.
           Anna knew.DEF it-ACC that   Peter sick
           'Anna knew that Peter was sick.'

     b.   Ha Péter beteg, nem dolgozik.
           if   Peter sick   not work.3SG
           'If Peter is sick, he isn't working.'

     c.   A   fiú, aki   beteg volt, nem dolgozik.
           the boy who sick   was not work.3SG
           'The boy who was sick is not working.'

The order of constituents in subordinate clauses has the same variation as in main clauses, except of course that (phrases containing) relative pronouns must be clause-initial. For more on this, see below in 1.1.2.3.

Note that the rules of punctuation in Hungarian require that all finite clauses be enclosed by commas, notwithstanding the intonation or the type of construction they are in.

1.1.2.2. Noun clauses

Clauses that occur in noun phrases can be one of the following five subtypes:

(a) *hogy* ('that') clauses with or without an expletive pronominal *az* 'it'
(b) complement clauses to nominal heads
(c) relative clauses with a pronominal head
(d) relative clauses with NP heads
(e) 'headless' or free relative clauses.

(79) a.   Anna tudta   (azt),   hogy Péter beteg.
           Anna knew.DEF it-ACC that   Peter sick
           'Anna knew that Peter was sick.'

     b.   Anna tudta az-t   a   tény-t,   hogy Péter beteg.
                       that-ACC the fact-ACC
           'Anna knew the fact that Peter was sick.'

     c.   Anna tudta   az-t,   ami-t   Péter elhallgatott.
           Anna knew.DEF it-ACC what-ACC Peter concealed
           'Anna knew what Peter had concealed.'

     d.   Anna tudta a   titkot,   amit Péter elhallgatott.
                    the secret.ACC
           'Anna knew the secret that Peter had concealed.'

     e.   Anna tudta, amit Péter elhallgatott.
           'Anna knew what Peter had concealed.'

In accordance with the structure of Routledge Descriptive Grammars, the last three will be discussed in 1.1.2.3, under adjective clauses, while noun complement clauses are treated in 1.2.5.2.10.

1.1.2.2.1. The marking and positions of noun clauses

Noun clauses as understood in this limited sense are always introduced by the complementizer *hogy* 'that', except in well-defined (though not necessarily well-understood) cases to be specified below.

Noun clauses cannot be directly marked for case; it is the pronoun *az* that carries the case suffix, unless it is omitted, which is in general possible in the nominative and the accusative.

Although subordinate clauses are most naturally placed finally in main clauses with the (often optional) pronominal inside the main clause, as in the case of all other finite clauses, preverbal positions are also possible and frequent (a) initially, with the pronominal preceding the clause, (b) initially, with or without the pronominal following the clause, and (c), less frequently, following some other initial constituent(s).

(80) a.   Azt,   hogy Péter beteg volt, Anna tudta.
            it.ACC that Peter sick   was Anna knew
            'That Peter had been sick was known to Anna.'

      b.   Hogy Péter beteg volt, (azt)   Anna tudta.
            that   Peter sick   was it.ACC Anna knew
            'That Peter had been sick was known to Anna.'

      c.   Anna (azt),   hogy Péter beteg volt, tudta.
            Anna it.ACC that   Peter sick   was knew
            'Anna knew that Peter had been sick.'

1.1.2.2.2. Types of noun clauses

Subject and object clauses are distinguished from clauses with oblique case-marked expletive pronouns, since the latter cannot be omitted under normal conditions. Moreover, oblique pronominals have a variety in postverbal positions that is identical to the oblique forms of the third person singular personal pronoun *ő* 'he/she/it', as against the only form that can occur preverbally and is identical to the demonstrative *az* 'that, it'.

(81) a.   (Az) hogy Péter beteg volt, mindenki-t   meglepett.
            it   that   Peter sick   was everyone-ACC surprised
            'That Peter was sick surprised everyone.'

b. Ar-ról, hogy Péter beteg volt, mindenki tudott.
    it-DEL that Peter sick was everyone knew
    ca. 'Everyone knew (about it) that Peter had been sick.'

c. Mindenki tudott *(ar-ról/ról-a), hogy Péter beteg volt.
    everyone knew it-DEL/DEL-it
    ca. 'Everyone knew (about it) that Peter had been sick.'

d. *Róla, hogy Péter beteg volt, mindenki tudott.

The personal pronominal version of the expletive cannot be deleted and it cannot occur preverbally in what is a topic or focus position. Thus it can – in fact, has to – occupy "weak" positions, just like its coreferential counterpart. In similar weak positions the coreferential third person singular pronoun can be dropped in the nominative or accusative.

(82) a. A   film jó,   de (*ról-a) Péter nem olvas-ott   *(ról-a).
         the film good but DEL-it Peter not read-PAST DEL-it
         'The film is good, but Peter hasn't read about it.'

b. A könyv jó, de Péter még nem olvas-t-a
                    but Peter yet not read-PAST-DEF.3SG

    Ø/*ő-t/?*az-t.
    (s)he/that-ACC
    'The book is good, but Peter hasn't read it.'

It stands to reason to assume that the weak form of the nominative and accusative expletive is identical to the (dropped) personal pronoun. Note that as a "real" pronoun only the null form of the personal pronoun can be used referring back to nonhuman/inanimate antecedents, and although the strong pronoun *az-t* 'that/it-ACC' is, in principle, somewhat better, since it indicates inanimacy, it is at least unjustified, if not ungrammatical.

That there is a definite object in the clause is indicated by the definite conjugation on the verb (glossed as "DEF") in the (b) example, as compared to the indefinite or "subjective" conjugation in example (a) above. Similar distinctions obtain above in (80)–(81) with respect to the object clauses with null expletives versus those with oblique pronominals as seen in the difference between *tud-ott* 'know-PAST.3SG' and *tud-t-a* 'know-PAST-DEF.3SG'. For more on the definite conjugation, see 2.1.3.6.1.2.

1.1.2.2.3. Indirect statements

Indirect statements as strictly understood are subsumed under object or noun complement clauses, but show no differences from other object clauses. As regards the changes from a direct quote, the only modification

apart from changes in reference, namely, sequence of tenses, will be discussed in 1.1.2.5.

(83) a.   Anna elmondta nekünk (azt),   hogy Péter beteg volt.
         Anna told.DEF to.us   it.ACC that Peter sick was
         'Anna told us that Peter had been sick.'

     b.   Anna cáfolta   azt az állítást, hogy Péter beteg volt.
         Anna denied.DEF that the statement.ACC
         'Anna denied the statement that Peter had been sick.'

1.1.2.2.4. Indirect questions

Indirect questions are understood here with reference to all subordinate interrogative clauses, whether the main clause predicate is a verb of saying or not. They can occupy any one of the structural positions (or equivalently, they can have any one of the syntactic functions), subject, object, oblique or noun complement.

(84) a.   (Hogy) ki   volt beteg, (az)   Anná-t   nem
         that   who was sick   it.NOM Anna-ACC not

         érdekelte.
         interested.DEF
         'Anna wasn't interested in who had been sick.'

     b.   Anna nem tudta   (azt),   (hogy) ki volt beteg.
              not   knew.DEF it.ACC
         'Anna didn't know who had been sick.'

     c.   Anna kíváncsi volt ar-ra,   (hogy) ki volt beteg.
         Anna curious was it-SUBL
         'Anna was curious about who had been sick.'

     d.   A kérdés, (hogy) ki   volt beteg, érdekes.
         the question that   who was sick   interesting
         'The question of who was sick is interesting.'

As is clear from the parentheses around the complementizer *hogy*, it can be freely deleted in all embedded question clauses.

    While indirect question-word questions do not differ from main clause questions, embedded yes–no questions require that the question clitic -*e*, which is optional in main clauses, always be present. (Focus is in bold type.)

(85) a.   Anna azt   kérdezte, (hogy) Péter beteg volt-e.
         Anna it.ACC asked.DEF that   Peter sick was-Q
         'Anna asked whether Peter had been sick.'

b.   Anna azt kérdezte, (hogy) Péter nem volt-e beteg.
                                     not
        'Anna asked whether Peter hadn't been sick.'

c.   Anna azt kérdezte, (hogy) **Péter** volt-e beteg.
        'Anna asked if it was Peter that had been sick.'

Naturally, the rise–fall pattern characteristic of main clause yes–no questions is missing in embedded ones.

1.1.2.2.5. Indirect commands

Indirect commands have the same structural properties as direct imperatives: the prefix (if any) is placed behind the verb, and the verb is marked by the affix *-j* (assimilated in various ways to the preceding phoneme).

(86) a.   Anna azt   mondta, (hogy) tanul-ja-d   meg a
         Anna it.ACC said.DEF that   learn-IMP-DEF.2SG PFX the

         verset.
         poem.ACC
         'Anna told you to learn the poem.'

b.   Anna azt javasolta,   (hogy) **Péter** tanulja meg a verset.
                  suggested.DEF
        'Anna suggested that **Peter** learn the poem.'

As indicated by the parentheses, the complementizer *hogy* can be omitted in indirect commands, too.

    Indirect commands are distinguished from subjunctive clauses that are complements to a distinct class of verbs, adjectives, and adpositions. Their finite verbs are in the subjunctive as indicated not by a different modality marker on the verb, since the imperative and the subjunctive are formally identical, but by (a) the nondeletability of the complementizer *hogy*, and (b) an obligatory prefix–verb order in the (nonfocussed) clause, which contrasts with the obligatory verb–prefix order in indirect commands.

(87) a.   Nem szükséges, *(hogy) Péter meg-tanul-j-a   a
         not   necessary   that   Peter PFX-learn-SUBJ-DEF.3SG the

         vers-et.
         poem-ACC
         'It isn't necessary for Peter to learn the poem.'

b.   *Nem szükséges, hogy Péter *tanulja meg* a verset.

c.   *Anna azt javasolta, hogy *meg-tanuljad* a verset.

Focus may of course overrule the neutral prefix–verb order and shift the prefix into a postverbal position.

1.1.2.2.6. Infinitival clauses

Infinitival clauses are the only nonfinite construction-type available for subject and complement functions. (Nominalizations are genuine noun phrases, disregarded here.)

(88) a.   Fontos   volt meg-tanul-ni   a   verset
           important was PFX-learn-INF the poem.ACC
           'It was important to learn the poem.'

   b.   Anna meg-próbál-t-a   meg-tanul-ni a verset.
        Anna PFX-tried-PAST-DEF.3SG
        'Anna tried to learn the poem.'

Verbs like *megpróbál* 'try', which constitute the first subclass of main verbs governing infinitival clauses, must be marked for the definiteness of the object of the infinitival clause.

  It is questionable whether the infinitival clause is (always) an object. Another group of verbs takes object clauses and infinitives, depending on subject identity between the main and the subordinate clauses. (An accusativus-cum-infinitivo construction is excluded with these verbs.)

(89) a.   Anna most akar   olvas-ni.
           Anna now wants read-INF
           'Anna wants to read now.'

   b.   Anna az-t   akar-ja,   hogy Péter most olvas-s-on.
        Anna it-ACC want-DEF.3SG that   Peter now read-IMP-3SG
        'Anna wants Peter to read now.'

   c.   *Anna akarja   Péter-t   olvas-ni.
        Anna   wants.DEF Peter-ACC read-INF

A third subclass of verbs cannot take (nominal or clausal) object complements at all, and, unlike *meg-próbál* 'try' above and the verbs in its group, they cannot undergo definiteness agreement with the object of their infinitival complement clause either.

(90) a.   Anna igyekez-ett/   *igyekez-t-e   meg-tanul-ni
           Anna strive-PAST.3SG / strive-PAST-DEF.3sg PFX-learn-INF

        a   vers-et.
        the poem-ACC
        'Anna strove to learn the poem.'

b. Anna meg-próbál-t-a   /*meg-próbál-t
    PFX-try-PAST-DEF.3SG/PFX-try-PAST.INDEF.3SG

megtanulni a verset.

'Anna tried to learn the poem.'

Both *igyekez-t-e* 'strive-PAST-DEF.3SG' in (a) and *meg-próbál-t* 'PFX-try–PAST.INDEF.3SG' in (b) would result in ungrammaticality. In addition, it is possible to use the question-word *mit* 'what-ACC' only with predicates like *akar* 'want' and *meg-próbál* 'try', but never with *igyekez-* 'strive'.

As far as indirect statements, commands, and questions are concerned, none of these is expressible by means of infinitival clauses. The cases that appear to be indirect commands or questions can be shown to fall under different headings.

In the example below the infinitival clause is one of purpose, a frequent construction in Hungarian, rather than a command, and an analogous (and synonymous) finite clause of purpose is always available.

(91) a. Anna meg-hívta   Pétert   fel-olvas-ni   a
         Anna PFX-invited.DEF Peter.ACC PFX-read-INF the

verset.
poem.ACC
'Anna invited Peter to read out the poem.'

b. Anna meghívta Pétert, hogy (az) fel-olvassa   a
                           that he   PFX-read.DEF the

verset.
poem.ACC
'Anna invited Peter in order that he read the poem.'

1.1.2.2.6.1–7. Properties of infinitival clauses   The verbal categories lost are all inflectional affixes marking tense, mood, definite object, though causative (CAUS) and frequentative (derivative) affixes (FREQ) can be retained. The (inflectional) affix expressing permission or possibility is also missing. For number and person, see below.

(92) a. Fontos   volt Pétert   olvas-tat-ni.
         important was Peter.ACC read-CAUS-INF
         'It was important to have Peter read.'

b.   Anna most akar   olvas-gat-ni.
Anna now wants read-FREQ-INF
ca. 'Anna wants to be reading (intermittently) now.'

c.   *Anna most akar olvas-hat-ni.
read-POSS-INF
'Anna wants to be permitted/it to be possible to read.'

Infinitives are formed by adding the invariant suffix -*ni* to the stem. The infinitive marker can be followed by optional person and number agreement with the subject, whether overt (and then always in the dative case) or suppressed.

(93) a.   Fontos   volt Péter-nek olvas-ni-a.
important was Peter-DAT read-INF-3SG
'It was important for Peter to read.'

b.   Fontos volt Péter-nek olvas-ni.
'It was important for Peter to read.'

c.   Fontos volt olvas-ni-a.
'It was important for him/her to read.'

d.   Fontos volt olvasni.
'It was important (for anyone) to read.'

When in complement function, however, the infinitival clause cannot be marked for person and the subject must be suppressed and consequently identical with the subject (or some other designated argument) of the main clause.

(94) a.   *Péter megpróbál úsz-ni-a.
Peter tries   swim-INF-3SG

b.   *Péter akar   Anná-nak úsz-ni-(a).
Peter wants Anna-DAT swim-INF-3SG

Note that person-marked infinitives in complement functions were acceptable in a previous period of the language, though dative subjects were not.

Apart from subjects, all other arguments are retained unchanged in infinitival clauses and no further morphological material in addition to the dative case assigned to (some) subjects is inserted. Adverbials are used in the same form as in finite clauses and all subtypes are possible.

(95)   Anna megpróbál gyakr-an/gyors-an/beteg-en   olvasni.
Anna tries   often-ADV/quick-ADV/ill-ADV read.INF
'Anna tries to read often/fast/(when she's) sick.'

1.1.2.2.6.8. Clause union   Constituents of infinitival clauses can move into main clauses with ease, especially, but not exclusively, if they become topics or foci in the main clause. Note that if they are raised into preverbal positions in the main clause, they are invariably interpreted as either topic or focus, depending on stress and the order of the preverbal constituent (verbal modifier) with respect to the inflected verb. (For focus and topic, see 1.11 and 1.12.)

(96)   a.   Ezt   a   könyvet   fontos   volt Jánosnak el-olvas-ni–a.
            this the book.ACC important was John.DAT PFX-read-INF-3SG
            'As for this book, it was important for John to read it.'

       b.   **Ezt a   könyvet**   akarja   Anna el-olvas-ni.
            this the book.ACC wants.DEF Anna PFX-read-INF
            'It's this book that Anna wants to read.'

       c.   Fontos volt ezt a könyvet elolvasnia Jánosnak.
            'It was important for John to read that book.'

Furthermore, there is a class of verbs that in the neutral case requires that the prefix or verbal modifier of the infinitive in the lower clause immediately precede it in the main clause, i.e., that it move in front of the finite matrix verb. Verbs of this "prefix-raising" class include the auxiliaries *fog* 'will', *szokott* 'used to', *talál* 'happen to', as well as full verbs like *tud, bír* 'can, be able to', *mer* 'dare', *óhajt, kíván* 'wish', *szeretne* 'would like', *akar* 'want'.

The class of "prefix-freezing" verbs, which do not allow such movement, contain *szeret* 'like', *imád* 'love', *utál* 'hate', *fél* 'fear', *siet* 'hurry', *igyekszik* 'strive', etc., and almost all predicative adjectives (e.g., *hajlandó* 'willing', *köteles* 'obliged'). For more, see Kálmán *et al.* (1989).

(97)   a.   Anna el   akarja   olvas-ni a   könyvet.
            Anna PFX wants.DEF read-INF the book.ACC
            'Anna wants to read the book.'

       b.   Anna igyekszik el-olvas-ni   a   könyvet.
            Anna strives   PFX-read-INF the book.ACC
            'Anna strives to read the book.'

       c.   *Anna el igyekszik olvas-ni a könyvet

Note that the order in which the finite main verb is followed by the prefix + infinitive is perfectly acceptable for the first class of verbs, provided the sentence is focussed, negated, or modified in some other comparable way that justifies the immobility of the prefix.

Finally, it should also be noted that although the infinitive is capable of assigning accusative to its object, it cannot be inflected for definiteness, unlike finite verbs. However, as was mentioned above, a number of ma-

trix verbs are marked for the definiteness of the object of the embedded infinitive. They include not only all of the "prefix-raising" verbs, but several of the "prefix-freezing" ones, in particular those that allow nominal objects as well as infinitival ones, e.g., *szeret* 'like', *imád* 'love'. In other words, the group of prefix-freezing verbs has two subclasses, that of object-agreement verbs, e.g., *szeret* 'like', and that of non-object-agreement verbs, like *fél* 'fear'. (Note that the absence of the suffix of the definite conjugation qualifies as indefinite conjugation in third person singular verb-forms as below.)

(98) a.   Anna most akar *(-ja)   el-olvas-ni   a   könyv-et.
         Anna now want-DEF.3SG PFX-read-INF the book-ACC
         'Anna wants to read the book now.'

    b.   Anna most akar (*-ja)   el-olvas-ni egy könyv-et.
                  wants-DEF.3SG   a   book-ACC
         'Anna wants to read a book now.'

    c.   Anna szeret *(-i)   el-olvas-ni a könyv-et.
               like-DEF.3SG
         'Anna likes to read the book.'

    d.   Anna fél (*-i)   el-olvas-ni a könyv-et.
              fears-DEF.3SG
         'Anna is afraid to read the book.'

1.1.2.3. Adjective clauses (relative clauses)

Strictly speaking, clauses that can be classified as adjectival comprise not only relative clauses but also ones that substitute for adjectival phrases, whether in attributive or predicative use, cf.:

(99) a.   Anna olyan könyvet olvas, amilyen-t Péter (olvas).
         Anna such book   reads what-ACC Peter reads
         ca. 'Anna is reading a book similar to what Peter is reading.'

    b.   Anna olyan volt, amilyen Péter (volt).
         Anna such was what   Peter was.'
         ca. 'Anna was like Peter.'

The glosses above are defective in that they do not reveal that the pro-adjective *o-lyan* in the main clause is analyzed into a "demonstrative" *o-* and an adjectival ending *-lyan/lyen* also found in the relative pronoun *a-mi-lyen*, whose first element *a-* is another form of the demonstrative. This demonstrative element defines relative pronominals if followed by question-words such as *mi* 'what', exclusively a pro-*noun* in Hungarian. Related properties of this structure will be discussed under degree clauses

(1.1.2.4.2.7) and equatives (1.9). In this section, however, we will restrict our attention to relative clauses.

1.1.2.3.1. The marking of relative clauses

Prenominal relative clauses are nonfinite, marked on the clause-final verb as an active ("present") or passive ("past") participle. For more discussion, see 1.1.2.3.9.

(100) a.   [A [könyv-et olvas-ó]   lány] beteg volt.
           the book.ACC read-APRT girl   sick   was
           'The girl reading a/the book was sick.'

      b.   [A [lány által olvas-ott] könyv] érdekes   volt.
           the girl by   read-PPRT book   interesting was
           'The book read by the girl was interesting.'

Postnominal relative clauses are marked by an optional demonstrative along with the lexical head noun and a (phrase containing the) obligatory relative pronoun in a clause-initial position.

(101)   (Az) a   könyv, amely-et   Anna olvas-ott, érdekes   volt.
         that the book   which-ACC Anna read-PAST interesting was
         'The book that Anna was reading was interesting.'

1.1.2.3.2. Restrictive and nonrestrictive

There is no structural difference between restrictive and nonrestrictive prenominal clauses, but it is possible, and in some positions necessary, to distinguish them by means of the distribution of accents. Much as in the case of simple prenominal adjectives, when the stress on the head noun is at the same level as that on the prenominal clause, the structure is interpreted as nonrestrictive. If the stress on the head noun is decreased, restrictive interpretation is in order. (['] stands for primary stress, [ˌ] for secondary stress, and no marking for zero stress.)

(102) a.   A 'szorgalmas 'magyarokat   'mindenki ˌmegbecsüli.
           the diligent   Hungarians.ACC everyone   appreciates
           'Everyone appreciates the diligent Hungarians.'
           (nonrestrictive – all Hungarians are diligent and all are
           appreciated)

      b.   A 'szorgalmas ˌmagyarokat 'mindenki ˌmegbecsüli.
           'Everyone appreciates diligent Hungarians.'
           (restrictive – some Hungarians are diligent and they are
           appreciated)

(103) a. [A ['sokat olvas-ó]   'magyarokat   'mindenki
          the much.ACC read-APRT Hungarians.ACC

          ,megbecsüli.

          'Everyone appreciates the Hungarians, who read a lot.'
          (nonrestrictive)

      b. [A ['sokat olvas-ó] ,magyarokat 'mindenki ,megbecsüli.
          'Everyone appreciates the Hungarians that read a lot.'
          (restrictive)

In postnominal (finite) clauses the distinction is not brought out by struc-
ture, types of relative pronoun, accents, pauses, intonation, or punctu-
ation, since although restrictives can be pronounced without a break
between the head noun and the clause, it is by no means obligatory, thus
restrictives and nonrestrictives can have identical formal properties.
There are, however, two tests that can be applied.

   For one, the demonstrative on the head noun disambiguates the
construction since it defines a restrictive reading. In case it is used as a
linguistic expression of extralinguistic deixis (pointing at the object), the
intonation will be different and the pause obligatory.

(104) a. (Az/*Ez) a   lány, aki a   könyvet olvassa,   beteg volt.
          that/this the girl   who the book.ACC reads.DEF sick   was
          'The girl who's reading the book was sick.'
          (restrictive)

      b. Ez/Az   a   lány, aki a könyvet olvassa, beteg volt.
          this/that the girl
          'This/That girl, who's reading the book, was sick.'
          (nonrestrictive)

While restrictives can be separated from their heads and occur in a clause-
final position in the main clause, nonrestrictives must be attached to their
heads.

(105) a. Az a lány beteg volt, aki a könyvet olvassa.
          'The girl was sick who's reading the book.'

      b. *Ez a lány beteg volt, aki a könyvet olvassa.
          'This girl was sick, who is reading the book.'

   Another test of limited scope can be devised on the basis of the
behaviour of relative pronouns with respect to numerical expressions in
the head noun phrase. In Hungarian, number is marked on the head noun
only if there is no numeral in the noun phrase; but if there is one, the head
noun will remain singular. The relative pronoun in the restrictive clause

can optionally agree with the singular head noun in number. The relative pronoun in nonrestrictives, in turn, must be in the plural.

(106) a. (Az) a   nyolc lány, aki-(k)   olvast-a/ák   a
          that the eight girl who-(PL) read-DEF.SG/PL the

          könyvet, . . .
          book.ACC
          'The eight girls that have read the book . . . '
          (restrictive)

      b. (Ez) a   nyolc lány, aki*(-k) olvast-a/ák a   könyvet . . .
          this the eight girl who-PL read-SG/PL the book.ACC
          'These/The eight girls, who have read the book, . . . '
          (nonrestrictive)

1.1.2.3.3. The position of the head noun

The head noun can be either before or after the clause; in the first case it is followed by a finite clause, in the second it is preceded by a nonfinite one, as was illustrated in section 1.1.2.3.1 above.

1.1.2.3.4–5. Relative pronouns

Hungarian uses obligatory relative pronouns in place of the relativized element. They are regularly derived from question-words by means of being prefixed by *a-*, which is historically identical to one form of the demonstrative *az*: cf. *a-ki* 'REL-who', *a-mennyi* 'REL-how.many', *a-hogy* 'REL-how', etc. A number of relative pronouns have varieties without the relative marker *a-*, which sometimes sound more archaic, e.g., *amely/mely* 'which', but *ami/?mi* 'which, what', *amennyi/*mennyi* 'as many/much'. Relative pronouns cannot be deleted and are always in a clause-initial position, except in one case in present-day Hungarian, which will be discussed in the section on degree clauses below, as well as in 1.8 and 1.9.

The selection of the relative pronoun depends on the human/ nonhuman, countable/uncountable, and specific/nonspecific distinctions in the head noun (or the relativized element), human antecedents requiring *aki* 'who', while nonhuman specific or countable antecedents select *amely* 'which' or, in the colloquial language, *ami* 'what, which', and nonspecific or uncountable nouns take *ami* 'what, which' in all registers. Note that pronominally headed clauses, when referring to [– human] antecedents, always take *ami* (rather than *amely*) pronouns in the relevant cases, just like headless or free relative clauses, whether or not the head is understood as specific or countable.

(107) a. Az, amit/*amelyet   Anna olvasott, érdekes   volt.
          that what/which.ACC Anna read   interesting was
          'What Anna was reading was interesting.'

      b. Az a   könyv, amit/amelyet   Anna olvasott, érdekes
          that the book   what/which.ACC Anna read   interesting

          volt.
          was
          'The book Anna was reading was interesting.'

      c. a   pénz, amit/?*amelyet   kölcsönöztél, . . .
          the money what/which.ACC lent.2SG
          'the money you lent'

      d. a   farkas, amely/?*ami az úton   áll, . . .
          the wolf   which/what the road.SUP stands
          'the wolf which is standing on the road'

1.1.2.3.6. Headless relative clauses

Headless (or free) nominal relative clauses occur as subjects and objects in main clauses, while structurally similar adverbial relative clauses can function as adverbs of place and time.

(108) a. Ami-t   Anna el-olvasott, érdekes   volt.
          what-ACC Anna PFX-read   interesting was
          'What Anna read was interesting.'

      b. Anna el-olvasta, ami   érdekes   volt.
          Anna PFX-read   what interesting was
          'Anna read what was interesting.'

(109) a. A-hol   Anna dolgozik, sok   könyv van.
          REL-where Anna works   many book is
          'There are many books where Anna works.'

      b. A-mikor   Anna dolgozik, sok   könyvet   olvas.
          REL-when Anna works   many book.ACC read.3SG
          'When Anna is working she reads many books.'

Headless nominal relative clauses have two varieties, thus they come from two sources. In object function, one of them requires the definite conjugation, the other the indefinite one.

(110) a. Tegy-ed,   ami-t   mond-t-am.
          do-DEF.2SG what-ACC say-PAST-1SG
          'Do what I told you to.'

    b.   *Tegy-él,   ami-t mond-t-am.
         do-INDEF.2SG

(111) a.   Tegy-él,   ami-t   akar-sz.
         do-INDEF.2SG what-ACC want-2SG
         'Do what(ever) you want to.'

    b.   *Tegy-ed,   ami-t akar-sz.
         do-DEF.2SG

The definite headless clause is interpreted as one introduced by a pro-nominal that can be dropped in subject and object functions ('Do the thing I told you to do'), as was seen in the case of complement clauses in 1.1.2.2.2. The indefinite headless relative clause is, in turn, interpreted as if it was introduced by a quantifier ('Do anything you want to do') and the relative pronoun was located in the head position. A similar contrast is observed in adverbial free relative clauses. (For more on this, see Kenesei 1994.)

1.1.2.3.7. Elements relativized

Since relative pronouns are formed of question-words, any item that can be questioned can be relativized as a rule. In harmony with the account in 1.1.1.2.2.1, below the following relativized positions will be illustrated: (a) subject, (b) object, (c) dative complement, (d) oblique noun phrase, (e) postpositional noun phrase, (f) case-marked standard of comparison, and (g) possessor noun phrase (marked for dative case).

(112) a.   Itt   van a   fiú, aki megtalálta a   választ.
         here is   the boy who found.DEF the answer
         'Here is the boy who's found the answer.'

    b.   Itt   van a   könyv, amely-et   a   fiú megtalált.
         here is   the book which-ACC the boy found
         'Here's the book which the boy found.'

    c.   Itt   van a   fiú, aki-nek   Anna felolvasta   a
         here is   the boy who-DAT Anna PFX.read.DEF the

        könyvet.
        book.ACC
        'Here's the boy to whom Anna read the book.'

    d.   Itt   van a   könyv, amely-ben a   fiú megtalálta a
        here is   the book   which-INE the boy found.DEF the

        választ.
        answer
        'Here's the book in which the boy has found the answer.'

    e.   Itt   van a   könyv, amely alatt   a   fiú megtalálta a
        here is   the book   which under the boy found.DEF the

        választ.
        answer.ACC
        'Here's the book under which the boy found the answer.'

    f.   Itt   van a   fiú, aki-nél   a   lány magas-abb.
        here is   the boy who-ADE the girl tall-er
        ca. 'Here's the boy who the girl is taller than.'

    g.   Itt   van a   fiú, aki-nek   a   könyv-é-t   Anna
        here is   the boy who-DAT the book-3SG-ACC Anna

        olvasta.
        read.DEF
        'Here's the boy whose book Anna read.'

Corresponding to each case-marked, postpositional, or adverbial question-word, there are case-marked, postpositional, or adverbial relative pronouns as well, e.g., *a-mi-hez* 'REL-what-ADE = to which', *a-mi-vel* 'REL-what-INS = with which'; *a-mi mögött* 'REL-what behind = behind which', *a-mi-óta* 'REL–what-since = since which/when'; *a-honnan* 'REL-where.from = from where', *a-hogyan* 'REL-how = in which way/manner', *a-miért* 'REL-why = for which reason', etc.

(113) a.   Itt   van a   szoba/*könyv, ahol   a   fiú megtalálta a
        here is   the room/book   where the boy found.DEF the

        választ.
        answer
        'Here's the room/book where the boy has found the answer.'

    b.   Ez   az, a-miért   Anna elolvasta   a   könyvet.
        This it   REL-why Anna PFX.read.DEF the book.ACC
        'That's why Anna read the book.'

Note that (a) standards of comparison in the alternative, clausal, construction cannot be relativized, (b) nor can possessed nouns.

(114) a.   *Itt van a   fiú, mint aki   a   lány magasabb.
        here is   the boy than who the girl taller

b. *Itt van a   könyv, Anná-nak ami-jé-t   Péter
    here is the book   Anna-DAT which-3SG-ACC Peter

olvasta.
read.DEF
ca. 'Here's the book the which of Anna's Peter read.'

1.1.2.3.8. Movement of phrases containing a relative pronoun

While question-words can carry along (i.e., "pied-pipe") relatively large phrases, relative pronouns are not capable of similar operations. (The suffix -*i*, glossed as ATTR, changes postpositional phrases into prenominal attributes.)

(115) a. Melyik fiú mögött-i   könyv-et olvasta   Anna?
          which boy behind-ATTR book-ACC read.DEF Anna
          ca. 'The book behind which boy has Anna read?'

   b. *Itt van a   fiú, aki mögött-i   könyv-et   Anna
       here is   the boy who behind-ATTR book-ACC Anna

olvas-ott/ta
read-INDEF/DEF
'Here's the boy the book behind whom Anna has read.'

Another construction-type that cannot be moved along with the relative pronoun, and thus cannot be relativized, is the prenominal relative clause.

(116) a. Milyen könyveket olvasó fiúkkal   találkoztál?
          what   books.ACC reading boys-INS met.2SG
          ca. 'Boys reading what books did you meet?'

   b. *Itt vannak a   könyvek, amelyeket olvasó fiúkkal
       here are   the books   which.ACC reading boys

találkoztál.
met.2SG
ca. 'Here are the books boys reading which you met.'

But, just as in the case of questions, relative pronominal possessor noun phrases cannot only carry along the whole noun phrase, they can be moved out of the possessive noun phrase with ease.

(117) a. Itt   van a   fiú, [aki-nek   a   könyv-é-t]   Anna
          here is   the boy who-DAT the book-POSS.3SG-ACC Anna

olvasta.
read.DEF
'Here's the boy whose book Anna has read.'

b.   Itt van a fiú, [aki-nek] Anna olvasta [_ a könyv-é-t]
'Here's the boy whose book Anna has read.'

But, whereas the possessed nominal can be questioned, it cannot be relativized.

(118) a.   Anná-nak   mi-jé-t   olvasta   Péter?
           Anna-DAT what-POSS.3SG-ACC read.DEF Peter
           ca. 'What that belongs to Anna did Peter read?'

   b.   *a könyv, Anná-nak   ami-jé-t   Péter olvasta, . . .
        the book   Anna-DAT which-POSS.3SG-ACC Peter read.DEF

   Again similarly to question-words, relative pronouns can be moved out of a finite or infinitival complement clause into a higher one.

(119) a.   Itt   van egy könyv, ami-t   nem tudom,   mikor
           here is   a   book   which-ACC not   know.1SG when

           olvassak el.
           read.1SG PFX
           'Here's a book which I don't know when I should read.'

   b.   Itt   van egy könyv, ami-t   fontos   volt elolvas-ni.
        here is   a   book   which-ACC important was read-INF
        'Here's a book which it was important to read.'

1.1.2.3.9. Nonfinite relative clauses

The two types of prenominal participial relative clauses were reviewed in section 1.1.2.3.1. (For more details, see Komlósy 1994.)

1.1.2.3.9.1. Active (present) participles   They have their subjects relativized, with all other complements (including accusative marked objects) retained.

(120) a.   [A [könyv-et a   fiú-nak   gyorsan olvas-ó]   lány] itt
           the book-ACC the boy-DAT fast   read-APRT girl   here

           van.
           is
           'The girl who reads the book to the boy fast is here.'

   b.   [A [fiú-val   minden nap találkoz-ó] lány] itt   van.
        the boy-INS every   day meet-APRT girl   here is
        'Here is the girl who meets the boy every day.'

Sentences with copulas or subjectless predicates do not have a nonfinite equivalent.

(121) a. A fiú diák   volt.
          the boy student was

      b. *[A [diák   val-ó/lév–ő] fiú] . . .
          the student be-APRT   boy
          'The boy was a student.'

(122) a. ∅ Havazik.
            snows

      b. *[A [havazó] hó/ég/ . . .]
          the snowing snow/sky
          'It's snowing.'

But the verb of existence (obligatorily) used with locative predicates can
be changed into an active participle.

(123) a.   A   könyv a   szobá-ban van.
           the book   the room-INE is
           'The book is in the room.'

      b. a   szobá-ban lév-ő   könyv
          the room-INE be-APRT book
          'the book in the room'

1.1.2.3.9.2. Passive (past) participles In the basic paradigm the passive
participle relativizes the object with the subject expressed by means of the
agentive postposition *által* 'by' and all other complements or adjuncts
retained. Note that the form of participial affix coincides with the 3SG (i.e.
unmarked) form of the past tense suffix in the indefinite conjugation.

(124) a. Anna tegnap   olvas-ott   egy könyv-et.
          Anna yesterday read-PAST a   book-ACC

      b. az [Anna által tegnap   olvas-ott] könyv
          the Anna by   yesterday read-PPRT book
          'the book read by Anna yesterday'

However, nonagentive intransitive verbs can relativize their subjects if
they are prefixed.

(125) a. A   könyv ki-nyíl-t   az első oldal-on
          the book PFX-open-PAST the first page-SUP
          'The book opened on the first page.'

      b. az [első oldalon   ki-nyíl-t]   könyv
          the first page.SUP PFX-open-PPRT book
          'the book that opened (by itself) on the first page' (nonagentive
          reading)

Achievement verbs can also be used in this construction with the subject relativized, even if they are agentive intransitive ones.

(126) a. A lány tegnap   London-ba érkez-ett.
            the girl yesterday London-ILL arrive-PAST
            'The girl arrived in London yesterday.'

      b. a [tegnap   London-ba érkez-ett]   lány
           the yesterday London-ILL arrive-PPRT girl
           'the girl that arrived in London yesterday'

      c. A lány a   medencé-be ugr-ott.
           the girl the pool-ILL   dive-PAST.3SG
           'The girl dived into the pool.'

      d. a [medencé-be ugr-ott]   lány
           the pool-ILL   dive-PPRT girl
           'the girl that (has/had) dived into the pool'

In colloquial Hungarian, transitive verbs in general are more and more used in this construction, with the subject relativized and expressing an action prior to that of the main clause.

(127) a. Az autós   el-gázol-t egy gyalogos-t.
           the motorist PFX-hit   a   pedestrian-ACC
           'The motorist hit a pedestrian.'

      b. Most beszéltünk [a [gyalogos-t   el-gázol-t]
           now spoke.1PL the pedestrian.ACC PFX-hit-PPRT

           autós-sal.
           motorist-INS
           'We have just spoken with the motorist that hit a pedestrian.'

1.1.2.4. *Adverbial clauses*

1.1.2.4.1. The marking and positions of adverbial clauses

Finite adverbial clauses have two subtypes: (a) they can be introduced by the general subordinating complementizer *hogy* 'that', often accompanied by the appropriate adverbial form of the pronominal *az* 'that, it' in the main clause, which acts as an anticipatory phrase or a "place-holder" for the topic or focus functions, which the clause cannot directly fulfill, or (b) they are more like (free) relative clauses with an initial relative pro-adverb.

(128) a.   Az-óta, hogy Anna megérkezett, Péter elolvasta a
           it-since that   Anna PFX.arrived   Peter PFX.read the

           könyvet.
           book.ACC
           'Since Anna arrived, Peter has read the book.'

      b.   A-mi-óta   Anna megérkezett, Péter elolvasta a
           REL-what-since Anna PRF.arrived   Peter PFX.read the

           könyvet.
           book.ACC
           'Since Anna arrived, Peter has read the book.'

The positions adverbial clauses can occupy are in general the same as those listed and illustrated in reviewing noun clauses: they can be (a) initial, (b) noninitial and preverbal, generally non-focussed, and (c) final.

(129) a.   Amikor Anna megérkezett, Péter olvasott.
           when   Anna PRF.arrived   Peter read
           'When Anna arrived, Peter was reading.'

      b.   Péter, amikor Anna megérkezett, olvasott.
           'When Anna arrived, Peter was reading.'

      c.   Péter olvasott, amikor Anna megérkezett.
           'When Anna arrived, Peter was reading.'

1.1.2.4.2. Types of adverbial clauses

In this section finite clauses are discussed. Nonfinite constructions are deferred to section 1.1.2.4.3. Due to the numbering conventions, place adverbial clauses, frequent in Hungarian, are given at the end of this section.

1.1.2.4.2.1. Time adverbial clauses   Time adverbial clauses are defined by (a) a pro-adverb in the main clause and/or (b) a (quasi-relative) time adverbial conjunction in the subordinate clause.

(130) a.   Az-előtt, hogy/a-mi-előtt   Anna megérkezett, olvasott.
           it-before that/REL-what-before Anna PRF.arrived   read.3SG
           'Before Anna arrived, she had been reading.'

      b.   (*A-)mi-előtt   Anna megérkezett, olvasott.
           REL-what-before Anna PRF.arrived   read.3SG
           'Before Anna arrived, she had been reading.'

The clauses can express (a) past, (b) present (general), and (c) future time reference depending on the form of the verb. Note that (c) is understood

as a plain future prediction, rather than a conditional, and present tense cannot be used in the time clause.

(131) a.   (A)mikor Anna olvasott,   Péter aludt.
            when   Anna read.PAST Peter slept
            'When/while Anna was reading, Peter was sleeping.'

       b.   (A)mikor Anna olvas,   Péter alszik.
            when   Anna read-PRES Peter sleeps
            'When(ever) Anna is reading, Peter is sleeping.'

       c.   (A)mikor Anna olvas-ni   fog, Péter alud-ni   fog.
            when   Anna read-INF will Peter sleep-INF will
            'When/While Anna will be reading, Peter will be sleeping.'

The illustrations above made use of nonprefixed verbs in both the subordinate and the main clauses. If, however, prefixed verbs are chosen, the paradigm has to change, especially since prefixed verbs have future reference in present tense.

(132) a.   Amikor Anna meg-érkezett, Péter aludt.
            when   Anna PFX-arrived   Peter slept
            'When Anna arrived, Peter was asleep.'

       b.   Amikor Anna meg-érkezik, Péter alszik.
            when   Anna PFX-arrives   Peter sleeps
            'When(ever) Anna arrives, Peter is asleep.'

       c.   Amikor Anna meg-érkezik, Péter aludni   fog.
            when   Anna PFX-arrives   Peter sleep.INF will
            'When Anna arrives, Peter will be asleep.'

If the time clause introduced by *(a)mikor* 'when' has a prefixed predicate, and a prefixed verb is used in the main clause, the two events are understood as ordered consecutively. By optionally suffixing the time conjunction, the order of events can be made more transparent.

(133) a.   Amikor (-ra) Péter el-aludt,   Anna meg-érkezett.
            when   -SUB Peter PFX-slept Anna PFX-arrived
            'When/By the time Peter had fallen asleep, Anna arrived.'

       b.   Amikor(-ra) Péter el-alszik,   Anna meg-érkezik.
            when -SUB Peter PFX-sleeps Anna PFX-arrives
            'When/By the time Peter falls asleep, Anna will arrive.'

Except for a few general adverbials like *mikor* 'when', *mi-óta* 'since (when)', disparate sets of time conjunctions are used for simultaneous versus consecutive events. Those marking simultaneity include: *mi-alatt*, *mi-közben* 'during (when)', *(a)míg* 'while', *ahogy, amint* 'as'. Clauses whose

action precedes or follows that of the main clause are introduced by conjunctions like *mi-után* 'after (when)', *mi-előtt* 'before (when)', *hogy* 'that, as', *mihelyt, alighogy* 'as soon as'.

The pro-adverb in the main clause, which points at the clause, can in a large majority of cases be inserted, and it is, in fact, obligatory if the clause is to be interpreted as focussed.

(134) a. (Akkor-ra,) amikor-ra Péter elalszik,   Anna megérkezik.
        then-SUB   when-SUB Peter PFX.sleeps Anna PFX.arrives
        'By the time Peter falls asleep, Anna will arrive.'

    b. Anna csak *(akkor-ra) érkezik meg, amikorra   Péter
        Anna only then-SUB   arrives PFX when.SUB Peter

        elalszik.
        PFX.sleeps
        'Anna will arrive only when Peter has fallen asleep.'

Since the conditional conjunction *ha* 'if' originates from a time adverb, it is small wonder that its meaning often oscillates between a temporal and a conditional reading, just as much as clauses introduced by unequivocal time conjunctions can have a conditional interpretation.

(135)   Ha Péter elalszik,   Anna megérkezik.
      if   Peter PFX.sleeps Anna PFX.arrives
      'When/If Peter falls asleep, Anna arrives/will arrive.'

1.1.2.4.2.2. Manner adverbial clauses   The most general and frequent pro-adverb associated with manner adverbial clauses in the main clause is *úgy* 'thus'; others include *ak-képpen* 'in that manner', *a-nélkül* 'without that'. The clause can be introduced by the general subordinating complementizer *hogy* 'that', or relative pro-adverbs like *a-hogy* 'REL-how = in which way', *a-mi-képpen* 'REL-what-TER = in which manner', *(a)-mi-nt* 'REL-what-FOR = as'.

(136) a. Péter úgy aludt el,   hogy olvasott.
        Peter thus slept PFX that   read.3SG
        'Peter fell asleep in such a manner that he was reading.'

    b. Péter úgy aludt, ahogy gyerekkorában   szokott.
        Peter thus slept as   in.his.childhood used.3SG
        'Peter fell asleep the way he used to in his childhood.'

1.1.2.4.2.3. Clauses of purpose   The anticipatory pro-adverb in the main clause can be *az-ért* 'that-CAU', *a-végett* 'that-in.order', although they can be easily dispensed with since the clause is in the subjunctive, thus providing an unequivocal clue for its interpretation. Clauses are introduced by a nonomissible complementizer *hogy* 'that'.

(137) a.   Anna olvasott, hogy el-alud-j-on.
           Anna read   that PFX-sleep-SUBJ-3SG
           'Anna was reading so that she could fall asleep.'

     b.   Péter az-ért   olvasott, hogy ne   alud-j-on   el.
           Peter that-for read   that not sleep-SUBJ-3SG PFX
           'Peter was reading so that he would not fall asleep.'

     c.   Péter azért olvasott, ne-hogy el-alud-j-on.
                                 not-that PFX-sleep-SUBJ-3SG
           'Peter was reading lest he fell asleep.'

Purpose clauses are the only contexts that allow the negative particle to be attached to the complementizer *hogy*, as in the (c) example above.

1.1.2.4.2.4. Clauses of cause   They are associated with pro-adverbs like *a-miatt* 'that-because' and *az-ért* 'that-for' and are introduced (a) by the complementizer *hogy* 'that' and, more often, (b) by a conjunction that goes back to a relative pro-adverb that no longer fills the role: *mert* 'lit. for-what = because'; (c) independent clauses of cause, i.e., ones that are not associated with any "pointer" in the main clause, are introduced by *mivel*, *minthogy*, *miután* 'since'. (Note that each has a distinct literal meaning, e.g., *mi-vel* 'what-with', which, however, no longer figures in their interpretation.)

(138) a.   Anna a-miatt   haragszik, hogy Péter elaludt.
           Anna that-because is.angry   that Peter PFX-slept
           'Anna is angry because Peter has fallen asleep.'

     b.   Anna az-ért   haragszik, mert   Péter elaludt.
           Anna that-for is.angry   because Peter PFX-slept
           'Anna is angry because Peter has fallen asleep.'

     c.   Mivel Péter elaludt,   Anna olvas.
           since Péter PFX.slept Anna reads
           'Since Peter has fallen asleep, Anna is reading.'

1.1.2.4.2.5. Conditional clauses   The obligatory conjunction is *ha* 'if', although its complex variety *hogy-ha* 'that-if = if' or the official-sounding *amennyiben* 'in as much as' can also be used. The main clause frequently contains the "place-holder" pro-adverb *akkor* 'then', especially if the conditional fills in the role of topic or focus, as in other cases reviewed above. Note that the clause itself can occur in focus position unless it is too long.

(139) a.   Ha Péter el-alszik,   (akkor) Anna meg-haragszik.
           if   Peter PFX-sleeps then   Anna PFX-is.angry
           'If Peter falls asleep, Anna will get angry.'

b. Anna csak *(akkor) haragszik meg, ha Péter el-alszik.
    Anna only then   is.angry   PFX if Peter PFX-sleeps
    'Only if Peter falls asleep, will Anna get angry.'

c. Anna csak [ha Péter el-alszik] haragszik meg.
    'Only if Peter falls asleep will Anna get angry.'

The basic subtypes of conditional constructions are as follows:

   (i) In real conditional clauses the verb can be in any of the past, present, or future tenses (or present tense with future reference if prefixed).

(140) a. Ha Péter elaludt,   Anna haragudni   fog.
          if Peter PFX.slept Anna be.angry. INF will
          'If Peter fell/has fallen asleep, Anna will be angry.'

   b. Ha Péter alszik, Anna haragudni   fog.
       if Peter sleeps Anna be.angry.INF will
       'If Peter is asleep, Anna will be angry.'

   c. Ha Péter aludni   fog, Anna meg-haragszik.
       if Peter sleep.INF will Anna PFX-be.angry
       'If Peter will be asleep, Anna will get angry.'

   (ii) In hypothetical clauses, the present conditional form of the verb is used with reference to present or future.

(141) a. Ha Péter alud-na,   Anna haragud-na.
          if Peter sleep-COND Anna be.angry-COND
          'If Peter were sleeping, Anna would be angry.'

   b. Ha Péter el-alud-na,   Anna haragud-na.
       if Peter PFX-sleep-COND Anna be.angry-COND
       'If Peter fell asleep, Anna would be angry.'

   (iii) In counterfactual conditionals, the verb is in past conditional, a complex form made up of the formal past tense of the verb and the invariable conditional form *volna* of the copula *van* 'be'. Note that the verb is marked for agreement with the subject.

(142) a. Ha Péter alud-t   volna, Anna haragud-ott   volna.
          if Peter sleep-PAST COND Anna be.angry-PAST COND
          'If Peter had been asleep, Anna would have been angry.'

   b. Ha Péter el-alud-t   volna, Anna most haragud-na.
       if Peter PFX-sleep-PAST COND Anna now be.angry-COND
       'If Peter had fallen asleep, Anna would be angry now.'

1.1.2.4.2.6. Result clauses   The result of the action or event expressed by the matrix predicate can take the form of a *hogy* ('that') clause with an

appropriate pro-element in the main clause, such as *olyan* 'so, such', *annyi(t)* 'so much/many/little/few (= such a quantity)', often marked similarly to degree adverbials by a suffix formally identical with the accusative -*t*.

(143) a. Péter annyi-t/olyan sok-at   aludt, hogy Anna
       Peter so.much/so much-ACC slept that Anna

       megharagudott.
       got-angry
       'Peter slept so much that Anna got angry.'

    b. Péter annyi/olyan   kevés könyvet   olvasott, hogy Anna
       Peter such-amount/so few   book.ACC read   that Anna

       megharagudott.
       got.angry
       'Peter had read so many/few books that Anna got angry.'

Note here that result clauses and clauses of purpose are differentiated only by the mood of the verb in the subordinate clause; while it is in the indicative in the above result clauses, it is in the subjunctive in clauses of purpose.

1.1.2.4.2.7. Degree clauses Both equative and comparative clauses can have anticipatory pro-elements in their main clauses, such as *olyan* 'such', *annyi(t)* 'so much/little-ACC', while in the clauses themselves the complementizer *mint* 'as, than' and the adjectival or adverbial relative pronominals *a-milyen* 'REL-what [Adj]' *a-mennyi(t)* 'REL-as.much-(ACC)', *a-hogyan* 'REL-how' can cooccur. In equative clauses, either (but never both) can be omitted, if the verbs are identical (see 1.9.3.) whereas in comparative clauses it is always the complementizer that has to stay. When the complementizer is absent, the clause becomes indistinguishable from, for example, an adverbial clause of manner, for which see above. Note that if the predicate of the clause is missing, minimally the conjunction *mint* and the object of comparison are always sufficient.

(144) a. Péter annyit   aludt, (mint) amennyit Anna (olvasott).
       Peter so.much slept as   as.much Anna read
       'Peter slept (just) as much as Anna (read).'

    b. Péter úgy alszik, (mint) ahogyan gyerekkorában (aludt).
       Peter thus sleeps as   how   in.his.childhood slept.3SG
       'Peter sleeps just like (he slept) in his childhood.'

(145) a. Péter többet alszik, mint Anna/mint amennyit Anna (alszik).
       Peter more   sleeps than   than as.much Anna sleeps
       'Peter sleeps more than Anna.'

b. Péter gyors-abb-an olvas, mint Anna/mint ahogyan Anna
   Peter quick-er-ly reads than   than how   Anna

   (olvas).
   reads
   'Peter reads faster than Anna.'

Such examples demonstrate that the relative pronoun (or pro-adverb) is not absolutely initial in its clause, an observation supported by data involving other conjunctions and relative pronouns from an earlier stage of the history of the language (cf. Kenesei 1994).

1.1.2.4.2.8. Concessive clauses Complex sentences having concessive clauses in them come in two subtypes: some qualify as subordination, others as coordination. The difference is shown by the potential of alternative orders in the former, but not in the latter.

(146) a. Anna olvas, noha/jóllehet/bár Péter alszik
          Anna reads although/albeit   Peter sleeps
          'Anna is reading, although/albeit Peter is sleeping.'

      b. Noha/Jóllehet/Bár Péter alszik, Anna olvas.
          'Although Peter is sleeping, Anna is reading.'

(147) a. Anna olvas, holott/pedig Péter alszik
          ca. 'Anna is reading, although Peter is sleeping.'

      b. *Holott/Pedig Péter alszik, Anna olvas.'

1.1.2.4.2.9. Place adverb clauses   Clauses that are classified as adverbials of place are usually free or pronominally headed relative clauses, whose relative pro-adverbial reveals the nature of the relationship.

(148) a. Péter ott   alszik, ahol   Anna olvas
          Peter there sleeps where Anna reads
          'Peter is sleeping where Anna is reading.'

      b. Ahol Anna olvas, Péter alszik.
          where Anna reads Peter sleeps
          'Where Anna reads, Peter sleeps.'

(149) a. Anna add-ig futott, amedd-ig a   csík   tartott.
          Anna that-to ran   where-to the stripe lasted
          'Anna ran as far as the end of the stripe.'

      b. Anna futott, ameddig a csík tartott.
          'Anna ran as far as the end of the stripe.'

1.1.2.4.3. Nonfinite adverbial clauses

Traditional grammars of Hungarian differentiate between (a) infinitives, (b) attributive participles (see 1.1.2.3.1), and (c) adverbial participials or converbs. Of these, only the first and the third types partake in forming nonfinite adverbial clauses, as will be illustrated below. In what follows, we will adhere to the numbering of subsections in the preceding section; therefore, if a subsection number is missing, there is no corresponding nonfinite adverbial clause there. For more on this topic, see de Groot (1995).

1.1.2.4.3.1. Nonfinite clauses of time   Of the two types of the so-called adverbial participial clause, or clauses containing converbs, the one that we will call simple and whose affix we will abbreviate as SCVB can be used to express simultaneous actions: (a) it suppresses the subject, but (b) all other complements and adjuncts can be freely retained; (c) if the verb is prefixed (and perfective), the simple converb can refer to an antecedent action.

(150) a.   Anna áll-va   olvasta a   könyvet.
            Anna stand-SCVB read   the book.ACC
            'Anna was reading the book standing.'

      b.   Anna olvasott a   könyvet   a   kezében   tartva.
            Anna read   the book.ACC the in.her.hand hold-SCVB
            'Anna was reading, holding the book in her hands.'

      c.   Anna [a   könyvet   le-té-ve]   elaludt.
            Anna the book.ACC down-put-SCVB fell.asleep
            'Having put the book down, Anna fell asleep.'

    Another, rather infrequently used, adverbial participial clause (with a somewhat literary or even archaic flavour) expresses antecedent actions. Its peculiarity is that it can contain a nominative subject noun phrase as well as any other complement appropriately case-marked. Only prefixed (perfective) verbs can occur here, which is why it is called here perfective converb and abbreviated as PCVB. Note that, owing to its increasing obsolescence, it often surfaces with nonperfective verbs in functions by and large identical with those of the simple converb.

(151) a.   El-olvas-ván   a   könyvet,   Péter elaludt.
            PFX-read-PCVB the book.ACC Peter fell.asleep
            'Having read the book, Peter fell asleep.'

      b.   Az eső el-áll-ván,   elindultunk a   hegytetőre.
            the rain PFX-stop-PCVB left.1PL   the hilltop.SUB
            'With the rain stopped, we left for the hilltop.'

1.1.2.4.3.2. Nonfinite clauses of manner   Simple participial clauses can often be taken to be manner adverbials, since they can be easily reinterpreted as specifying the manner in which the action was carried out, a point that shows the fallibility of such distinctions.

(152) a.   Péter [a   könyvet   szorosan a   kezében   tart–va]
        Peter the book.ACC fast   the in.his.hand hold-SCVB

        olvasott.
        read-PAST
        'Peter was reading holding the book fast in his hands.'

    b.   Péter [a   lapokat ki-tép-ve]   olvassa a   könyvet.
        Peter the pages   PFX-tear-SCVB reads   the book.ACC
        'Peter is reading the book tearing out its pages.'

1.1.2.4.3.3. Nonfinite clauses of purpose   Infinitives are an option some main verbs can choose for an adverbial clause of purpose, provided the subject of the infinitival clause is identical with the subject or some complement of the main clause, since infinitival clauses have to suppress their subjects.

(153) a.   Péter el-ment   olvas-ni a   könyvet.
        Peter away-went read-INF the book.ACC
        'Peter has gone to read the book.'

    b.   Anna elküldte Péter-t   [a   könyvet   olvas-ni]
        Anna sent   Peter-ACC the book-ACC read-INF
        'Anna sent Peter to read the book.'

1.1.2.5. Sequence of tenses

Two tenses are morphologically marked: (a) past and (b) present. Future is expressed by means of either (c) an analytic form made up of the auxiliary *fog* 'will' and the infinitive of a nonperfective (generally unprefixed) verb or (d) the present tense form of a perfective (or prefixed) verb. Note that the analytic future of perfective verbs has spread quite extensively in present-day Hungarian; since *fog* is prefix-raising, it is placed between the prefix and the verb in the neutral case (see (e) below).

(154) a.   Péter olvas.
        Peter read.3SG
        'Peter is reading.'

    b.   Péter olvas-ott.
        Peter read-PAST.3SG
        'Peter was reading.'

  c. Péter olvas-ni fog egy könyvet.
   Peter read-INF will a book.ACC
   'Peter will be reading a book.'

  d. Péter el-olvas egy könyvet.
   Peter PFX-read.3SG a book.ACC
   'Peter will read (= finish reading) a book.'

  e. Péter el fog olvas-ni egy könyv-et.
   'Peter will read (= finish reading) a book.'

In complement clauses, the time of the event reported in the clause is taken to be relative to the time of the action in the main clause and is expressed by the same tenses, which observe the following regularities.
(i) In the case of nonperfective verbs, (a) present tense forms stand for simultaneous actions, (b) past tense forms for antecedent actions.

(155) a. Anna tudta, hogy Péter olvas.
   Anna knew that Peter reads
   'Anna knew that Peter was reading.'

  b. Anna tudta, hogy Péter olvas-ott.
   Anna knew that Peter read-PAST.3SG
   'Anna knew that Peter had (been) read(ing).'

(ii) In the case of perfective verbs, (a) present tense forms signal "future-in-the-past", while (b) past tense forms denote actions accomplished prior to the time of the action in the main clause.

(156) a. Anna tudta, hogy Péter el-olvas egy könyvet.
   Anna knew that Peter PFX-reads a book.ACC
   'Anna knew that Peter would read a book.'

  b. Anna tudta, hogy Péter el-olvas-ott egy könyvet.
   Anna knew that Peter PFX-read-PAST.3SG a book.ACC
   'Anna knew that Peter had read a book.'

 Finally, the analytic future form is used to construct the 'future-in-the-past' for unprefixed verbs, but, as was noted, it is possible to form an analytic future of prefixed verbs, in both subordinate and main clauses.

(157) a. Anna tudta, hogy Péter olvas-ni fog.
   Anna knew that Peter read-INF will.3SG
   'Anna knew that Peter will/would be reading.'

b. Anna tudta, hogy Péter el-olvas/el   fog   olvas-ni egy
Anna knew that Peter PFX-read/PFX will.3SG read-INF a

könyvet.
book.ACC
'Anna knew that Peter will/would read a book.'

While tense in complement clauses is always understood as relative to
the main clause, tenses in adjunct clauses (including relatives) are under-
stood as independent of those in the main clause.

(158) a. Bár   Anna el-alud-t,   Péter olvas-ni fog.
Although Anna PFX-sleep-PAST Peter read-INF will
'Although Anna has fallen asleep, Peter will be reading.'

b. Anna ír-ta a   könyvet, amelyet   Péter olvas-ni fog.
Anna wrote the book.ACC which.ACC Peter read-INF will
'Anna wrote the book that Peter will be reading.'

For indirect commands, see section 1.1.2.2.5.

1.2. STRUCTURAL QUESTIONS

1.2.1. Internal structure of the sentence

1.2.1.1. Copular sentences

Copular sentences have two varieties: nominal and adjectival ones are
constructed without the copula in the "unmarked" case, i.e., when the
verb is in present indicative third person singular and plural, as discussed
in the next two subsections contracted into one. In adverbial copular sen-
tences, however, the copula has to occur in all persons. For more on this,
see 1.2.1.1.4–5.

Below neutral word order is illustrated throughout unless otherwise
noted. For focussed sentences and constituent orders, see 1.11.

1.2.1.1.1–2. Copular sentences with nominal and adjectival complement

In these constructions the predicate noun or adjective agrees in number
with the subject, as shown by the plural suffix below.

(159) a. A lány magas/diák volt.
the girl tall/student was
'The girl was tall/a student.'

b. A lány-ok magas-ak/diák-ok volt-ak.
the girl-PL tall-PL/student-PL were-PL
'The girls were tall/students.'

The only exception is when a collective noun is used predicatively. But even then it is easier to have a singular predicative noun with other than third person subjects, cf. (a). If there is a third person subject, the construction feels awkward, see (b); and synonymous expressions can take over, cf. (c). The alternative, i.e., plural predicative noun, is not workable, since the resulting meaning would be different, cf. (d). Note, finally, that in the present tense the issue of subject–predicate agreement does not arise, because the copula is nonovert, cf. (e).

(160) a.   Mi jó   csapat volt-unk.
            we good team   were-1PL
            'We were a good team.'

       b.   ??A lányok jó   csapat voltak.
            the girls   good team   were
            'The girls were a good team.'

       c.   A lányok jó   csapat-ot alkottak.
            the girls   good team-ACC formed
            'The girls formed a good team.'

       d.   A lányok jó csapatok voltak.
            'The girls were good teams.'

       e.   A lányok jó csapat.
            'The girls are a good team.'

The difficulty experienced with the (b) case may go back to properties of agreement in Hungarian. In the case of a non-third person subject its agreement requirements overrule those of the (apparently third person) predicate nominal. If, then, both the subject and the predicate nominal are third person, but they differ in number, a genuine conflict of agreement arises.

    In addition to plural agreement on the adjective – which, incidentally, does not agree with head nouns inside noun phrases – another interesting property of this construction is the absence of the indefinite article from in front of the singular noun (phrase). Although in current colloquial Hungarian the use of the indefinite article has been spreading, there is still a marked difference in at least a number of constructions. When an adjective + noun construction occurs, the use of the indefinite article is becoming the rule, see (a). If, however, there is a single noun in the predicate, the absence/presence of the indefinite article can make the difference between (b) a literal and (c) a metaphorical interpretation.

(161) a.   A mi osztályunk (egy) jó   csapat volt
            the our class   a   good team   was
            'Our class was a good team.'

b.   Anna őrmester volt.
Anna sergeant was
'Anna was a sergeant.'

c.   Anna egy őrmester volt.
'Anna was (like) a (real) sergeant.'

Neither the noun nor the adjective has any marking other than the plural suffix in finite clauses. If, in turn, they are part of an infinitival clause, they assume what appears to be a dative case suffix.

(162) a.   [Jó   csapat-nak lenni] nehéz   volt.
good team-DAT be-INF difficult was
'It was difficult to be a good team.'

b.   [Magas-nak lenni]   nem mindig volt jó.
tall-DAT   be-INF not   always was good
'It wasn't always good to be tall.'

The dative marking on the predicative adjective is probably related to the same case on subject complement adjectives in predicates like *látszik* 'seem' or *tűnik* 'appear', but note that predicative adjectives in infinitival complement clauses of verbal predicates do not change into the dative.

(163) a.   Anna magas-nak látszott.
Anna tall-DAT   seemed
'Anna seemed tall.'

b.   Anna magas(*-nak) akart   lenni.
Anna tall-DAT   wanted be.INF
'Anna wanted to be tall.'

So far, only the absence or presence of the indefinite article has been illustrated. Naturally, if there is a definite article on the predicate nominal (or the adjective), it changes the sentence into a statement of identity.

(164) a.   Anna a diák   volt.
Anna the student was
'Anna was the student.'

b.   Anna a   magas volt.
Anna the tall   was
'Anna was the tall one.'

Two comments are in order here. First, adjectives can be used as elliptical noun phrases in Hungarian, and they can also be case-marked as such. Secondly, with two definite noun phrases in a statement of identity, questions of order become relevant in as much as it is possible to exchange the

two noun phrases without difficulty, though not without a change of topic–focus structure, as will be seen in 1.11, the section on emphasis.

The unmarked order of the constituents is as has been illustrated throughout: Subject–Noun/Adjective–Copula (if overt).

1.2.1.1.3. Copular sentences with adverbial complement

These constructions differ from nominal and adjectival ones in that the copula is in general present in all persons and numbers. Here only sentences with definite subject noun phrases are illustrated. Those with indefinite subjects will be treated directly in section 1.2.1.1.6.2.

(165) a. Anna a   szobá-ban van.
          Anna the room-INE is
          'Anna is in the room.'

      b. A lányok jól   vannak.
          the girls   well are
          'The girls are well.'

      c. Az óra tegnap   volt.
          the class yesterday was
          'The class was yesterday.'

For reasons relating to the obligatory presence of the copula, existential sentences with numerals in the predicate are also included in this subsection, rather than the previous one. This construction is applicable only to human (or at best animate) subjects, and then the predicative numeral is marked by a curious -an/en suffix, cf. 1.16.6. When inanimate or non-human subjects are involved, a quasi-partitive construction takes over.

(166) a. A lányok négy-en   van-nak.
          the girls   four-AFX be-3PL
          'The girls are four.'

      b. *A könyvek négy-en van-nak.
          the books

      c. Könyv-ből négy van.
          book-ELA four is
          'Of books, there are four.'

The order illustrated, i.e. Subject–Adverbial–Copula, corresponds to neutral sentences. In a presentative construction, however, in which an existential/locative predication is made, the place adverbial is placed initially with the subject following it and the third person singular form of the copula can be omitted.

(167) a. Az asztal-on a   könyv.
          the table-SUP the book
          ca. 'On the table is the book.'

      b. Előtt-ed   az élet.
          before-2SG the life
          ca. 'Before you is your entire life.'

Apart from adverbial suffixation the predicate adverbial is not marked in any way.

1.2.1.1.4–5. Copular sentences without overt copula

Apart from the adverbial predicates without overt copula just discussed, the only structures without the copula are nominal and adjectival predicates in present indicative third person forms, whether singular or plural.

(168) a. A lány magas/diák.
          the girl tall/student
          'The girl is tall/a student.'

      b. A lány-ok magas-ak/diák-ok.
          the girl-PL tall-PL/student-PL
          'The girls are tall/students.'

The rest of the paradigm is as follows. Note that subject pronouns can be omitted if unstressed throughout.

(169) a. Én magas vagyok.
          I   tall   am

      b. Te   magas vagy.
          you.SG tall   are

      c. Mi diák-ok   vagyunk.
          we student-PL are

      d. Ti   diák-ok   vagytok.
          you.PL student-PL are

In nonindicative moods or past tense, the copula is required. (Past tense was shown above.)

(170) a. Anna diák   legyen.
          Anna student be.SUBJ
          'Anna ought to be a student.'

      b. Anna diák   lenne.
          Anna student be.COND
          'Anna would be a student.'

1.2.1.1.6. Types of copula

1.2.1.1.6.1. The suppletive forms of the copula   There are two verbs in the role of the copula, the "stative" *van* 'is' forms the present and past forms, as illustrated all through above. However, it does not have an infinitive; it is the verb *lesz* 'will-be, become' that serves as the base of the infinitive, the future, or, for that matter, of the nonindicative forms shown above. (The analytic future **fog lenni* 'will will-be' is ungrammatical.)

(171) a. Anna diák   lesz.
          Anna student will-be
          'Anna will be/become a student.'

      b. A   lányok magasak lesznek.
          the girls   tall.PL   will-be
          'The girls will be tall.'

      c. Anna nem akar   diák   lenni.
          Anna not wants student be-INF
          'Anna doesn't want to be/become a student.'

Lesz is ambiguous between a stative and a dynamic ('become') meaning in its finite (future) as well as nonfinite (infinitival) uses, since it has no alternative there. In the past tense, however, there is a difference between *volt* and *lett*, the former signifying state and the latter a change of state, cf.:

(172) a. Anna diák volt.
          'Anna was a student.'

      b. Anna diák lett.
          'Anna became a student.'

   In the third person present forms (both singular and plural) the negated copula has another set of suppletive forms: *nincs(en)* 'is not' and *nincsenek* 'are not'. For all other persons and tenses the analytic negative *nem* 'not' + copula is used, including those in which the copula is omitted.

(173) a. Anna nincs   a   szobá-ban.
          Anna not.be.3SG the room-INE
          'Anna isn't in the room.'

      b. A   lány-ok nincsen-ek jól.
          the girl-PL not.be.3-PL well
          'The girls aren't well.'

(174) a. Anna nem volt a   szobá-ban
          Anna not was the room-INE
          'Anna wasn't in the room.'

b. A lány-ok nem magas-ak.
   the girl-PL not tall-PL
   'The girls aren't tall.'

1.2.1.1.6.2. Existential sentences The copula (in third person singular or plural) has to occur in the common form of sentences expressing the existence of some object at some location. The subject, which by definition is indefinite, occurs invariably in postverbal position, provided the sentence has no focus or emphasis in it. Thus the order of constituents is: Copula–Subject–Complement or Complement–Copula–Subject, with possible time adverbials placed initially or finally. Each lexical head, including the copula, is stressed with equal intensity.

(175) a. Van egy könyv az asztal-on.
         is a book the table-SUP
         'There is a book on the table.'

      b. Holnap az irodá-ban lesz egy kis munka.
         tomorrow the office-INE will-be a little work
         'There will be some work (to do) in the office tomorrow.'

      c. Volt néhány lány a csapat-ban tavaly.
         were some girl the team-INE last-year
         'There were some girls in the team last year.'

A more marked variety of existential sentences is the one that may contain no adverb of place complement, but even if it does it expresses "pure" existence by omitting all articles from in front of the subject nominal, thus making it nonspecific. Ordering requirements are the same as above.

(176) a. **Van** könyv az asztal-on.
         is book the table-SUP
         'There **is/are** (a) book(s) on the table.'

      b. **Lesz** munka az irodá-ban.
         will-be work the office-INE
         'There **will** be work (to do) in the office.'

      c. **Vannak** egyszarvúak.
         are unicorns
         'Unicorns exist.'

The constituent order seen in these sentences is parallel to that in verbal presentational clauses, in which the verb precedes the subject and the complements, and is stressed more prominently than the rest of the sentence, as marked by bold type. For more, see below. Note that this verb-first structure is ungrammatical if the subject is definite, cf. 1.2.1.1.3.

1.2.1.1.6.3. Possessional sentences with copula   Hungarian is one of the languages that construct sentences expressing possession by means of a case-marked possessor, the copula, and a possessed nominal in the nominative. Since they will be discussed in more detail in section 1.10, the review given here concentrates on their properties related to the copula. For an extensive analysis, see Szabolcsi (1986/1992, 1994).

These structures are analogous to existential sentences in that their "subjects" must be indefinite, and the distinctions arising from the presence or absence of the articles carry over here. Note here that the possessor is in the dative and the possessed noun is marked for agreement with the possessor, glossed simply as "POSS" below. The neutral order is: Possessor–Copula–Possessed–Other.

(177) a.   Anná-nak van egy könyv-e   London-ról.
           Anna-DAT is   a   book-POSS London-DEL
           'Anna has a book about London.'

      b.   Péter-nek van egy kis   munká-ja   a   hivatal-ban.
           Peter-DAT is   a   little work-POSS the office-INE
           'Peter has some work in the office.'

When there is no article on the possessed nominal, "pure" existential interpretation takes over with the most prominent stress, indicated by capitals, falling on the copula.

(178) a.   Anná-nak **van** könyv-e London-ról.
           'Anna DOES have (a) book(s) about London.'

      b.   Péter-nek **van** munká-ja (a hivatal-ban).
           'There IS work for Peter (in the office).'

1.2.1.1.6.4. Another possible copula   Only one main verb can be classified as a quasi-copula: *marad* 'remain', since it takes nominal and adjectival complements unsuffixed for dative or any other case but agreeing in number with the subject. All other possible candidates, like *látszik* 'seem', *tűnik* 'appear', *válik* 'become' mark their complement nominals or adjectives for dative or some other case, and at least in some dialects their adjectival complements, in others even their nominal ones, may lack agreement in number with the subject.

(179) a.   Anna magas/diák maradt.
           Anna tall/student remained.3SG
           'Anna remained tall/a student.'

      b.   A   lány-ok magas-ak/diák-ok maradt-ak.
           the girls   tall-PL/student-PL remained-3PL
           'The girls remained tall/students.'

(180) a.   Anna magas-nak/diák-nak   látszott.
            Anna tall-DAT/student-DAT seemed.3SG
            'Anna seemed (to be) tall/a student.'

      b.   A   lányok magas-(ak)-nak/diák-(ok)-nak látszott-ak.
            the girls   tall-PL-DAT/student-PL-DAT seemed-3PL
            'The girls seemed (to be) tall/students.'

1.2.1.2. *Verbal sentences*

1.2.1.2.1. Verbal sentences without subjects

Sentences with weather-verb predicates have no subjects at all. Although Hungarian is a pro-drop language, and suppressed subjects are frequent, they are always recoverable and can be made overt, as will be seen at the end of this subsection. In sentences with weather-verbs such reconstruction is not possible. Adjuncts can freely be added throughout these constructions.

(181) a.   (Én) olvas-ok.
            I   read-1SG
            'I'm reading.'

      b.   (Az) érdekes   volt.
            it   interesting was
            'It was interesting.'

(182) a.   (*Az) havaz-ott.
            it   snow-PAST.3SG
            'It was snowing.'

      b.   (*Az) fagy-ni   fog.
            it   freeze-INF will
            'It will be freezing.'

A number of weather-verbs are derived from nouns expressing meteorological phenomena or times of the day, as seen below, where "VRB" is a gloss for a denominal or deadjectival derivational affix.

(183) a.   Villám-l-ott.
            lightning-VRB-PAST.3SG
            'Lightning's struck.'

      b.   Este-led-ett.
            evening-VRB-PAST.3SG
            'Evening was falling.'

    c.   Be-sötét-ed-ett.
        PFX-dark-VRB-PAST.3SG
        'It has become dark.'

As Komlósy (1994) notes, there is an equivalent construction-type for some of these weather-verb sentences, making use of a (possibly modified) adjective or noun. He argues that these too can be considered subjectless clauses.

(184) a.   A   szobá-ban (nagyon) meleg/hideg/sötét volt.
        the room-INE very   hot/cold/dark   was
        'It was (very) hot/cold/dark in the room.'

      b.   Itt   (nagy) hőség van.
        here big   heat is
        'It's very hot here.'

Sentences with optional dummy or expletive subjects are a result of pro-drop that allows pronominals to be omitted in nonprominent positions. The (overt) expletive invariably has the form *az* 'it, that' in the nominative.

(185)   (Az) érdekes,   hogy Anna olvasta a   könyvet.
        it   interesting that Anna read.DEF the book.ACC
        'It is interesting that Anna has read the book.'

Possessional sentences provide some problem in identifying their subject: since the "notional subject", the possessor, is in the dative, while the object of possession is in the nominative, in traditional grammars the latter was regarded as the subject. Under Szabolcsi's (1986/1992, 1994) analysis, however, the possessor is moved out of the possessive noun phrase, which as a whole constitutes the subject of an existential sentence. For more details, see 1.10. The coindexed trace of the moved possessor is marked by "*t*".

(186) a.   Van [Anná-nak egy könyv-e]
        is   Anna-DAT a   book-POSS
        'There is a book of Anna's.'

      b.   Anná-nak$_i$ van [t_i egy könyv-e]
        lit. 'To Anna is a book of hers.' = 'Anna has a book.'

Impersonal constructions are also possible in this language, where passive is mostly nonexistent. As in a number of other languages, e.g., Italian, pro-dropped third person plural subjects can be used to stand for unspecified agents. Note that these unexpressed agents are invariably construed as human, even if the predicate would generally require a nonhuman subject.

(187) a. Kopog-t-ak   az ajtó-n.
               knock-PAST-3PL the door-SUP
               'They/Someone knocked at the door.' = 'There was a knock at
               the door.'

     b. Meg-gyilkol-t-ák   Indira Gandhi-t.
               PFX-assassinate-PAST-DEF.3PL Indira. Gandhi-ACC
               'Indira Gandhi has been assassinated.'

     c. Ugat-t-ak.
               bark-PAST-3PL
               'There was barking.' = 'Someone was barking.'

Finally, although apparently subjectless, sentences with pro-dropped subjects do not belong under this heading. Subject pronouns in all persons and numbers can be suppressed in any tense or mood; in fact, their presence is required only if they would occur in one of the more "prominent" positions, such as topic or focus.

(188) a. (Én) olvas-ok.
               I   read-1SG

     b. (Te) olvas-ol.
               you read-2SG

     c. (Ő) olvas.
               (s)he read.3SG

     d. (Mi) olvas-unk.
               we   read-1PL

     e. (Ti) olvas-tok.
               you read-2PL

     f. (Ők) olvas-nak.
               they read-3PL

1.2.1.2.2. Transitive and intransitive verbs

Intransitive verbs take no objects, while transitive verbs must have an object complement.

(189) a. Péter kopog (*egy ajtó-t).
               Peter knocks a   door-ACC
               'Peter is knocking (the door).'

     b. Péter fog   *(egy ajtó-t).
               Peter holds a   door-ACC
               'Peter is holding a door.'

A large class of transitive verbs can be used intransitively as activity verbs with their "natural objects" understood, e.g., *ír* 'write', *olvas* 'read', *eszik* 'eat', etc. Another set of transitive verbs denote properties when intransitive, e.g., *ráz* 'shake something' vs. 'give (electric) shocks', *rúg* 'kick something/somebody' vs. 'have the habit of kicking people'. Yet another group is like underived nonagentive intransitive verbs, although Hungarian has a variety of derivational affixes for this purpose, cf. (*jól*) *húz* '(well) pull' vs. 'has the ability of pulling (carts, etc.) well'. Finally, a limited set of agentive verbs can be used intransitively to denote repeated or characteristic actions, e.g., *nyit* 'open', *zár* 'close', *kiköt* 'dock', although there are again available detransitivized forms available in principle, such as *nyílik* 'open (intr.)', which signify single events not involving agents.

(190) a.   Péter nyit-ott egy bolt-ot.
           Peter open-ed a   shop-ACC

      b.   A bolt kilenc-kor nyit/*nyílik.
           the shop nine-at   opens
           'The shop opens at nine.'

Transitive verbs have two conjugations. If the third person object is definite, the definite or "objective" conjugation is used; if it is indefinite (or the verb is intransitive), the indefinite or "subjective" conjugation is required. (For more, see 2.1.3.6.1.2.) The definite conjugation makes it possible to drop the object pronominal if it is in the singular, but if plural it has to be retained, even if the antecedent has been given in the context.

(191) a.   Olvas-om.
           read-DEF.1SG
           'I'm reading it.'

      b.   Olvas-od.
           read-DEF.2SG
           'You are reading it.'

      c.   Olvas-sa.
           read-DEF.3SG
           '(S)he is reading it.'

      d.   Olvas-suk.
           read-DEF.1PL
           'We are reading it.'

      e.   Olvas-sá-tok.
           read-DEF.2PL
           'You are reading it.'

    f.   Olvas-sák.
        read-DEF.3PL
        'They are reading it.'

(192) a. Olvas-om   *(ők-et/azok-at).
        read-DEF.1SG them[– human]
        'I'm reading them.'

    b. Lát-om   *(őket).
        see-DEF.1SG them[+ human]
        'I see them.'

Other than third person pronouns can also be dropped if singular, but then the indefinite conjugation is used (for first person objects), or a particular "second person object" (2OBJ) suffix is attached to the verb in first person singular.

(193) a. Lát-sz   (engem)/minket.
        see-2SG me/us
        'You see me/us.'

    b. Lát   (engem)/minket.
        see.3SG me/us
        'S/he sees me/us.'

    c. Lát-lak   (téged)/titeket.
        see-2OBJ.1SG you.SG/PL
        'I see you.'

    d. Lát   (téged)/titeket.
        see.3SG you.SG/PL
        'S/he sees you.'

1.2.1.2.3. Indirect objects

Strictly speaking, there are no indirect objects in Hungarian, though we will use the term for ease of reference. Indirect objects are expressed solely by means of a noun phrase in the dative case.

(194) a. Anna Péter-nek adott egy könyv-et.
        Anna Peter-DAT gave a   book-ACC
        'Anna gave a book to Peter.'

    b. Anna Péter-nek el-mesélt   egy történet-et.
        Anna Peter-DAT PFX-recounted a   story-ACC
        'Anna told a story to Peter.'

Since only subject pronouns (whether singular or plural) and singular object pronouns can be suppressed, indirect objects cannot be pro-

dropped, nor can any other arguments of the verb. Note that the dative has a number of different functions in Hungarian, such as marking the possessor, the subject of infinitives, or the nominal or adjectival complements of a number of verbs.

1.2.1.2.4. Other arguments

There are a large number of possible arguments of verbs as well as adjectives in cases other than the accusative or dative, which the following will illustrate. Some of these oblique arguments are optional, marked by parentheses, others are obligatory.

(195) a. Anna Péter-re   bíz-ott   egy könyv-et.
          Anna Peter-SUB entrust-PAST a   book-ACC
          'Anna entrusted Peter with a book.'

      b. Anna vár   (Péter-re).
          Anna waits Peter-SUB
          'Anna is waiting (for Peter).'

(196) a. Anna nem könyörül   Péter-en.
          Anna not   has-mercy Peter-SUP
          'Anna doesn't have mercy on Peter.'

      b. Anna segített (Péter-en).
          Anna helped Peter-SUP
          'Anna helped (Peter).'

(197) a. Péter mentes az   irigység-től.
          Peter free   the envy-ABL
          'Peter is free from envy.'

      b. Péter független   volt (az apjá-tól).
          Peter independent was the his.father-ABL
          'Peter was independent (of his father).'

(198) a. Anna foglalkozott a   könyv-vel.
          Anna dealt   the book-INS
          'Anna dealt with the book.'

      b. Anna beszélt (Péter-rel).
          Anna spoke   Peter-INS
          'Anna spoke (with Peter).'

Another group of verbs determines the general nature of the argument, such as locative or directional, but does not specify the case in question. (For more on this, see Komlósy 1994.)

(199) a.   Péter most ért   a   ház-ba   /rét-re   /fa   alá . . .
           Peter now reached the house-ILL /meadow-SUB /tree under
           'Peter has now reached the house/meadow/under the tree.'

      b.   Péter a   ház-ban   /rét-en   /fa   alatt . . . lakik.
           Peter the house-INE /meadow-SUP /tree under   lives
           'Peter lives in the house/meadow/under the tree.'

Note that the sentences are ungrammatical if no complements occur. In
other words, these verbs have obligatory arguments.
   Manner adverbs also appear as obligatory complements with a limited
class of verbs.

(200)   Anna *(jól) bánik Péter-rel.
           Anna well treats Peter-INS
           'Anna treats Peter well.'

A large class of transitive verbs take case-marked nouns (without any
article) or adjectives that are traditionally classified as object comple-
ments, although they are in fact predicated of the object in some kind of
secondary predication.

(201) a.   Péter könyv-vé alakította a   kézirat-ot.
           Peter book-TRA formed   the manuscript-ACC
           'Peter formed the manuscript into a book.'

      b.   Anna barná-ra   sütötte a   kenyer-et.
           Anna brown-SUB baked the bread-ACC
           'Anna baked the bread brown.'

      c.   Anna unalmas-nak tartja   Péter-t.
           Anna boring-DAT considers Peter-ACC
           'Anna considers Peter (to be) boring.'

Other verbs are lexically intransitive and take subject complements in
oblique cases, or can be transitivized in a construction type similar to the
one seen above.

(202) a.   Anna vidám-má   változott.
           Anna cheerful-TRA changed
           'Anna has become cheerful.'

      b.   Anna *(rekedt-re) kiabált-a   a   hangjá-t.
           Anna hoarse-SUB shouted-DEF the her.voice-ACC
           'Anna shouted (until) her voice (turned) hoarse.'

Manner, time, place, etc. adjuncts can be added freely over and above the
obligatory arguments illustrated above, depending on the semantics of
the verb or adjective in the predicate.

1.2.1.2.5. Combinations of arguments

Usually the highest number of arguments a verb can take is four: subject, object, indirect object, and an oblique argument. It is also possible for some verbs to have two oblique arguments if they are intransitive.

(203) a. Péter küldött egy könyv-et Anná-nak.
           Peter sent   a   book-ACC Anna-DAT
           'Peter sent a book to Anna.'

     b. Anna beszélt Péter-rel a   könyv-ről.
           Anna spoke   Peter-INS the book-DEL
           'Anna spoke with Peter about the book.'

However, in one class of verbs – those denoting transactions, such as *elad* 'sell', *vesz* 'buy', *megrendel* 'order' – in addition to the subject, the object, and the indirect object or source, a fourth argument determined by the verb, i.e., one expressing the price of the merchandise, can also occur.

(204)   Péter vett   egy könyv-et Anná-tól száz   forint-ért.
           Peter bought a   book-ACC Anna-ABL hundred forint-CAU
           'Peter bought a book from Anna for a hundred forints.'

1.2.1.2.6. Order of constituents

In the neutral order, the (definite) subject is followed by the verb and the direct and indirect objects, possibly also in a reversed order, just as in the case of oblique arguments. Since the definiteness of the object can affect the selection of the verb (demanding a choice between prefixed and non-prefixed), minimal pairs involving definite and indefinite objects are often hard to find. (The sentences are ungrammatical only under a neutral, nonfocussed, reading.)

(205) a. *neutral*
           Péter *(meg)-vette a   könyv-et Anná-tól.
           Peter   PFX-bought the book-ACC Anna-DEL
           'Peter bought the book from Anna.'

     b. *neutral*
           Péter *(el)-küldte Anná-nak a   könyv-et.
           Peter   PFX-sent   Anna-DAT the book-ACC
           'Peter sent the book to Anna.'

Objects and other arguments with no article, i.e., "verbal modifiers" or "reduced complements", are placed in front of the (nonprefixed) verb. They are nonspecific and often form a semantic unit with the verb up to idiomaticity.

(206) a.   Péter könyv-et   olvas (*el).
           Peter book-ACC reads PFX
           'Peter is reading (a) book(s).' = 'Peter is engaged in the activity of
           book-reading.'

      b.   Anna fal-ra   akasztotta a   kép-et.
           Anna wall-SUB hung.DEF the picture-ACC
           'Anna hung the picture on a wall.'

      c.   Péter rész-t   vett az előadás-on.
           Peter part-ACC took the lecture-SUP
           'Peter took part in the lecture.'

      d.   A   puska csütörtök-öt   mondott.
           the gun   Thursday-ACC said
           'The gun misfired.'

Note here that É. Kiss (1987, 1994) does not recognize neutral sentences in
Hungarian, while others, e.g., Kálmán (1985), Kenesei (1986), Horvath
(1986), Varga (1986), argue for neutral stresses and/or constituent order.

1.2.1.3. Adverbials

1.2.1.3.1. Types of adverbials

1.2.1.3.1.1. Adverbs   The following illustrate adverbs of time, place,
manner, and frequency.

(207) a.   Itt/Most/Idén   Anna olvassa   a   könyvet.
           here/now/this.year Anna reads.DEF the book.ACC
           'Anna is reading the book here/now/this year.'

      b.   Anna gyors-an/gyakr-an olvassa   a   könyvet.
           Anna quick-ly/frequent-ly reads.DEF the book.ACC
           'Anna reads/is reading the book fast/often.'

There are a few lexical adverbs, some of which have extinct or unanalyz-
able adverbial case suffixes, as in the (a) example above, or are more or
less obsolete compound time adverbs, such as names of parts of the day –
reggel 'morning', *dél-előtt* 'noon-before, morning', *dél-után* 'noon-after,
afternoon' – or end in *nap* 'day', e.g., *tegnap* 'yesterday', *holnap* 'tomor-
row', *vasárnap* 'Sunday'.

1.2.1.3.1.2. Postpositional phrases   According to one calculation
(Marácz 1991), there are fifty-four postpositions in this exclusively post-
positional language. The exact number is hard to determine since there
are some whose status is transient; for more on criteria, see 1.2.4.1. Most

define place adverbials, a good many of them are time adverbials, and some are used to express the beneficiary, the instrument, or some other role in the action or predication. They come in two subtypes: one apparently takes an NP in the nominative, but on closer scrutiny these postpositions turn out to behave syntactically like case suffixes, although they are independent words morphologically. This class will be called "case-like" postpositions. The other group assigns some oblique case to the noun phrase, and they will be labeled as "real" postpositions. Both subclasses belong to "core" postpositions, in contrast to "transitional" ones, which are in the process of becoming postpositions.

(208) a. A könyv az asztal alatt van.
          the book the table under is
          'The book is under the table.'

      b. Péter az előadás után érkezett.
          Peter the lecture after arrived
          'Peter arrived after the lecture.'

      c. Anna Péter iránt szeretet   érez.
          Anna Peter for   affection.ACC feels
          'Anna feels an affection for Peter.'

      d. Péter Anna helyett   beszélt.
          Peter Anna instead-of spoke
          'Peter spoke instead of Anna.'

(209) a. A könyv a   szobá-n   kívül   van.
          the book the room-SUP outside is
          'The book is outside the room.'

      b. Péter két órá-n   belül érkezett.
          Peter two hour-SUP inside arrived
          'Peter arrived in two hours.'

      c. Péter Anná-hoz képest   magas volt.
          Peter Anna-ALL compared tall   was
          'Peter was tall compared to Anna.'

1.2.1.3.1.3. Cases   There are some twenty-one oblique case suffixes listed in grammars of Hungarian. Again exact numbers are difficult to determine, not only because of the blurred dividing line between cases and postpositions, but also because the "end" of the list seems to taper off into highly unproductive suffixes such as *nyar-anta* 'summer-SFX', meaning roughly 'every summer, regularly in summer', but it can hardly be added even to all expressions denoting periods of time, cf. **órá-nta* 'hour-SFX', which has the form *órá-nként* 'hour-ly' instead.

With this caveat in mind, let us see examples for productive case suffixes defining adverbs of place and time. First, the characteristic "tridirectional" property of Finno-Ugric suffixes for place adverbials is illustrated: like postpositions of place, most have different forms for expressing the place of the action/event, the direction toward, and the direction from some place. First place adverbials, then adverbials of time, are given.

(210) a.   Anna a   ház-ban   lakik.
           Anna the house-INE lives
           'Anna lives in the house.'

      b.   Anna a   ház-ba   lépett.
           Anna the house-ILL entered
           'Anna entered into the house.'

      c.   Anna a   ház-ból   érkezett.
           Anna the house-ELA arrived
           'Anna came from the house.'

(211) a.   Péter holnap-ra   el-olvassa   a   könyvet.
           Peter tomorrow-SUB PFX-reads.DEF the book.ACC
           'Peter will read the book by tomorrow.'

      b.   Péter március-ban vette   a   könyvet.
           Peter March-INE   bought.DEF the book.ACC
           'Peter bought the book in March.'

1.2.1.3.1.4. Adverbial clauses   The large majority of adverbial clauses are finite, although nonfinite clauses of time, purpose, and manner occcur, as was discussed in 1.1.2.4. in detail.

1.2.1.3.2. Positions of adverbials

The possible positions of adverbials are (a) initial, (b) following the first phrase in topic, (c) in a post-topic (or pre-quantifier) position, and (d) final. Since a sentence adverbial can occur in any one of them, one such expression will serve as illustration.

(212) a.   *Anna szerint*   Péter tegnap   könyvet   olvasott a
           Anna according Peter yesterday book.ACC read   the

           házban.
           house-INE
           'According to Anna, Peter was reading a book in the house yesterday.'

b. Péter *Anna szerint* tegnap könyvet olvasott a házban.
'According to Anna, Peter was reading a book in the house yesterday.'

c. Péter tegnap *Anna szerint* könyvet olvasott a házban.
'According to Anna, Peter was reading a book in the house yesterday.'

d. Péter tegnap könyvet olvasott a házban *Anna szerint*.
'According to Anna, Peter was reading a book in the house yesterday.'

Time and place adverbs generally have the same choice of occurrence. Postverbal arguments are placed adjacent to the verb and one another, but the order of these adjuncts is relatively free: *tegnap* and *a házban* in the example above, for instance, can be interchanged, or both placed in front of the subject *Péter*, or behind the verb.

Manner adverbials are more restricted as regards their positions. They occur either in (a) the pre-focus or (b) the focus position. Manner adverbials that have positive meaning are in (a), those with a negative meaning are in (b). Note that the focus position is optionally available for positive adverbials. For more, see Kiefer (1967), É. Kiss (1987, 1994).

(213) a. Anna kielégítően   meg-oldotta/oldotta meg a
Anna satisfactorily PFX-solved.DEF   the

feladat-ot.
assignment-ACC
'Anna did the assignment satisfactorily.'
'It was in a satisfactory manner that Anna did the assignment.'

b. Anna elégtelenül   oldotta
Anna unsatisfactorily solved.DEF

meg/*meg-oldotta a feladat-ot.
PFX
'Anna did the assignment unsatisfactorily.'

Clauses have the same choices as simple adverbials, except that they cannot be placed in the focus position.

(214) a. Amikor Anna olvasott, Péter aludt a   szobában
when   Anna read   Peter slept the room-INE
'When Anna was reading, Peter was sleeping in the room.'

b. Péter, amikor Anna olvasott, aludt a szobában.
'When Anna was reading, Peter was sleeping in the room.'

    c.   Péter aludt a szobában, amikor Anna olvasott.'
        'When Anna was reading, Peter was sleeping in the room.'

1.2.1.3.3. Obligatory adverbials

Some obligatory adverbials were discussed and illustrated in 1.2.1.2.4 in connection with the argument structure of verbs.

1.2.2. Adjective phrases

1.2.2.1. Operational definition

Adjective phrases occur (a) in predicates containing a copula, (b) in noun phrases, and (c) as (subject or object) complements of one class of verbs.

(215) a. A   könyv nagyon érdekes   volt.
        the book   very   interesting was
        'The book was very interesting.'

    b. az érdekes   könyv
        the interesting book

    c. A   könyv érdekes-nek   tűnik
        the book   interesting-DAT appears
        'The book appears interesting.'

    d. Anna érdekes-nek   tartott-a   a   könyv-et.
        Anna interesting-DAT considered-DEF the book-ACC
        'Anna considered the book interesting.'

These environments can differentiate between adjectives and attributive expressions whose heads are traditionally considered as derived adjectives, such as (216) active (or present) participles, and (217) -i affixed postpositional phrases.

(216) a. a   sétáló   fiú
        the walk-APRT boy
        'the walking boy'

    b. *A fiú sétáló   volt.
        the boy walk-APRT was

(217) a. az Anna előtt-i   fiú
        the Anna before-AFX boy
        'the boy in front of Anna'

b. *A fiú-t   Anna előtti-nek   látom.
    the boy-ACC Anna before-AFX see.1SG
    'I see the boy as (one) in front of Anna.'

Since, however, nouns without the article can fill the very same positions, as seen in the following examples, and, moreover, adjectives can be case-marked just like nouns, further criteria have to be found. (Note that the form of definite article *az/a* depends on whether the following word begins with a vowel or a consonant.)

(218) a. Péter diák/unalmas   volt.
          Peter student/boring was
          'Peter was a student/boring.'

     b. a(z) diák/unalmas   eladó
         the student/boring salesperson

     c. Anna diák-nak/unalmas-nak   tartotta   Péter-t.
         Anna student-DAT/boring-DAT considered.DEF Peter-ACC
         'Anna considered Peter a student/boring.'

Admittedly, the (b) case is one of compounding if the two nouns are side by side, but that has to be shown by independent devices, such as the difference between stress patterns, with the compound having a single stress and the adjective + noun construction separate stresses on each word. But further tests may dispel any doubts concerning the distinction between adjectives and nouns.

First of all, (a) adjectives take adverbials, such as *nagyon* 'very', *kissé* 'little', *rendkívül* 'extremely', etc. Then they have (b) comparative and (c) superlative forms, expressed invariably by affixation in Hungarian. Note that the superlative is marked by a discontinuous morpheme consisting of the comparative suffix and the superlative prefix, surrounding the adjective, as it were.

(219) a. Péter nagyon unalmas/*diák volt.
          Peter very   boring/student was
          'Peter was very boring/*student.'

     b. Péter unalmas-abb/*diák-abb   volt.
         Peter boring-CMP/student-CMP was
         'Peter was more boring/*more student.'

     c. Péter volt a   leg-unalmas-abb/*leg-diák-abb.
         Peter was the SPR-boring-CMP/SPR-student-CMP
         'Peter was the most boring/*most student.'

It is to be noted here that various derived phrases, usually classified as adjectival, do not pass the tests reviewed here: thus (a) active participles,

(b) passive participles – unless they are lexicalized, (c) phrases derived by means of the suffix -*i* from postpositional phrases, and (d) phrases derived by means of the participle *való* 'being' from complements of nominalized predicates. They all occur in attributive functions in noun phrases, but fail each of the other criteria listed.

(220) a. egy [(könyv-et) olvas-ó]   lány
          a   book-ACC read-APRT girl
          'a girl reading (a book)'

      b. a(z) [(sok-szor) olvas-ott] könyv
          the many-times read-PPRT book
          'the book read (many times)'

      c. egy [az asztal-om   alatt-i]   könyv
          a   the table-POSS.1SG under-SFX book
          'a book under my table'

      d. az [asztal alatt való] olvas-ás
          the table   under being read-NML
          'the reading under the/a table'

1.2.2.2. *Arguments in adjective phrases*

1.2.2.2.1. Adjectives in subjectless sentences

As was mentioned above, a few adjectives occur in sentences that cannot have overt subjects.

(221) a. Tél-en   itt hideg van.
          winter-SUP here cold is
          'In winter it is cold here.'

      b. A   szobá-ban tegnap   sötét volt.
          the room-ILL yesterday dark was
          'It was dark in the room yesterday.'

It would be futile to try to claim that the words in questions, i.e., *hideg* and *sötét*, are adjectives *and* nouns, and they are predicate nouns here, especially since adjectives can stand in for nouns in elliptical noun phrases. But recall that "bare" nouns in such sentences express "pure" existence and require that the copula be stressed and placed initially or at least in front of them. Here neither is the case, cf. 1.2.1.1.6.2. Moreover, the words in question can be modified by intensifiers, such as *nagyon* 'very', *borzasztóan* 'terribly', etc., which are never used to modify nouns.

1.2.2.2.2–4. Arguments of adjectives

No adjective has a direct object complement, i.e., none governs an accusative noun phrase. No adjective has an indirect object argument either, since the category does not exist in Hungarian. When an adjective has a dative-marked argument, it may express either the beneficiary or the experiencer.

(222) a.   *colloquial*
            Anna sáros   volt Péter-nek.
            Anna indebted was Peter-DAT
            'Anna was owing money to Peter.'

      b.   Anna fontos   volt Péter-nek
           Anna important was Peter-DAT
           'Anna was important to Peter.'

The dative arguments can occur also if the adjective is within a noun phrase.

(223)   a [Péter-nek fontos]   könyv
           the Peter-DAT important book
           'the book important to Peter'

   A number of adjectives have optional (oblique) case-marked or postpositional noun phrase arguments, or infinitival clauses. The illustrations below are by no means exhaustive as to the variety of cases or the number of adjectives.

(224) a.   Péter szerelmes volt Anná-ba.
           Peter amorous   was Anna-ILL
           'Peter was in love with Anna.'

      b.   Anna biztos volt a   dolog-ban.
           Anna certain was the matter-INE
           'Anna was certain of the matter.'

      c.   Péter kedves lesz   Anná-hoz.
           Peter kind   will-be Anna-ALL
           'Peter will be kind to Anna.'

      d.   Anna óvatos   Péter-rel szemben.
           Anna cautious Peter-INS against
           'Anna is cautious with Peter.'

      e.   Péter képtelen volt olvas-ni.
           Peter unable   was read-INF
           'Peter was unable to read.'

They can preserve their arguments if placed in noun phrases, but, as above, the adjectival head has to be phrase-final.

(225) a.   az [Anná-ba szerelmes] fiú
           the Anna-ILL amorous   boy
           'the boy in love with Anna'

    b.   a   [dolog-ban biztos] diák
         the matter-ILL certain student
         'the student certain of the matter'

    c.   az [Anná-hoz kedves] emberek
         the Anna-ALL kind   people
         'the people kind to Anna'

    d.   a   [Peter-rel szemben óvatos] lány
         the Peter-INS against cautious girl
         'the girl cautious with Peter'

    e.   az [olvas-ni képtelen] lány
         the read-INF unable   girl
         'the girl unable to read'

Some adjectives take finite clauses as arguments, introduced by (some-
times optional) oblique case-marked expletive pronouns. While these
expletives can allow finite clauses to be placed outside noun phrases, they
are structurally too far from their clauses when inside adjectival phrases
that are embedded in noun phrases, so clausal arguments are not possible
there. The other alternative, viz., that a finite clause stays inside the adjec-
tive or noun phrase, is impossible as a rule in such left-branching
constructions.

(226) a.   Anna biztos (ab-ban), hogy Péter beteg volt.
           Anna certain it-ILL   that Peter sick was
           'Anna is certain that Peter was sick.'

    b.   Péter kíváncsi (ar-ra), hogy ki   volt beteg.
         Peter curious it-SUB that who was sick
         'Peter is curious who was sick.'

(227) a.   *az [abban, hogy Péter beteg volt, biztos] lány
           the it.ILL   that Peter sick was certain girl

    b.   *[az [abban t_i biztos] lány]] [hogy Péter beteg volt]$_i$
         the it.ILL   certain girl   that Peter sick was
         'the girl certain that Peter was sick'

1.2.2.3. *Modification of adjectives*

In addition to the adverbs or intensifiers illustrated in 1.2.2.1, finite
clauses introduced by a lexical or expletive head (and, for a number of
speakers, infinitival clauses) can also modify adjectives.

(228) a. Az előadás rendkívül/igen unalmas volt.
           the lecture extremely/very boring   was
           'The lecture was extremely/very boring.'

       b. Az előadás elég   rövid volt ah-hoz, hogy figyel-j-ünk
           the lecture enough short was it-ALL that listen-SUBJ-1PL

           rá.
           SUB.3SG
           'The lecture was short enough for us to listen to it.'

       c. Az előadás olyan unalmas volt, hogy nem figyelt-ünk
           the lecture so   boring   was that not listened-1PL

           rá.
           SUB.3SG
           'The lecture was so boring that we weren't listening to it.'

       d. Az előadás túl unalmas volt ah-hoz, hogy figyel-j-ünk
           the lecture too boring   was it-ALL that listen-SUBJ-1PL

           rá.
           SUB.3SG
           'The lecture was too boring for us to listen to it.'

       e. %?Az előadás túl unalmas volt felven-ni.
           the   lecture too boring   was record-INF
           'The lecture was too boring to record.'

Again, finite clauses cannot occur either in or outside of an adjective
phrase within a noun phrase, though simple adverbial or infinitival
modifiers can, since they can be placed to the left of the adjectival head. It
is worth mentioning that infinitival complements are somewhat more
acceptable here.

(229) a. a [rendkívül/igen/nem (nagyon) unalmas] előadás
           the extremely/very/not   very   boring   lecture

       b. *[az [ahhoz elég   érdekes]   előadás] hogy felvegyük
           the it-ALL enough interesting lecture   that we.record.it
           'the interesting enough lecture to record (it)'

       c. %?[a [felven-ni túl unalmas] előadás]
           the record-INF too boring   lecture
           'the too boring lecture to record'

   Finally, note that some adjectives can also be used without any
adverbial suffixation to serve as modifiers of a limited set of adjectival
phrases, e.g., *szép* 'nice', *jó* 'good', etc., + *kis* 'little', *nagy* 'big', etc.

(230) a. jó   kis   előadás
       'good little lecture'

     b. szép nagy bukás
       'nice big   flop'

1.2.3. Adverbial phrases

1.2.3.1. Operational definition

Adverbial phrases usually have notional definitions, mostly relying on eliciting them by reference and in answer to various (adverbial) question-word questions. In view of this functional approach, (case-marked) adverbial and postpositional phrases (see section 1.2.4) overlap. Somewhat more formal is the procedure of substitution for unanalyzable lexical adverbs, such as those corresponding to English *now, tomorrow; here, out-(side); fast*, etc. Some of these, especially place adverbials, can appear as obligatory arguments of a class of verbs and provide another context for demonstration; others, in particular time adverbials, occur only as free adjuncts.

(231) a. Anna kint/a   ház-ban   lakik.
       Anna outside/the house-INE lives
       'Anna lives outside/in the house.'

     b. Anna most/holnap/két   év   múlva érkezik.
       Anna now/tomorrow/two year after   arrives
       'Anna will arrive now/tomorrow/in two years.'

     c. Péter jól/gyors-an/toll   nélkül   ír.
       Peter well/quick-ADV/pen without writes
       'Peter writes well/fast/without a pen.'

1.2.3.2–4. Modification of adverbials

The most common structure of modification is adverbial: the general derivative affix (*-an/en*) producing "manner" adverbs from adjectives is used to provide modifiers for place and time adverbial phrases and also intensifiers for manner adverbials.

(232) a. Anna messze kint/ *a   házban   lakik.
       Anna far   out   the house-INE lives
       'Anna lives far outside/*in the house.'

    b.   Anna épp-en/pontos-an ide/holnap/két   év   múlva
        Anna just-ly/exact-ly   here/tomorrow/two year after

        érkezik.
        arrives
        'Anna will arrive just/exactly here/tomorrow/in two years.'

    c.   Péter kifejezett-en/nagy-on   jól/gyors-an ír.
        Peter pronounced-ly/great-ly well/quick-ly writes
        'Peter writes positively/very well/fast.'

Postpositional manner adverbial phrases cannot be modified by the usual intensifiers, except for those affirming the truthfulness of the statement.

(233) a.   *Péter kifejezetten toll nélkül ír.
          Peter positively   pen without writes
          'Peter writes positively without a pen.'

      b.   Péter való-ban/igaz-án/tény-leg   toll nélkül ír.
          Peter real-INE/true-ADV/fact-ADV pen without writes
          'Peter writes really/indeed/in fact without a pen.'

While *való-ban* above appears to be a case-marked noun or adjective, it is in fact a lexically derived adverb, like the others.

    In addition to lexical(ly derived) adverbs, finite adverbial clauses mostly of degree can also modify adverbial phrases. As was illustrated before, these clauses are associated with the "pointer" *olyan* 'so' in the main clause.

(234) a.   Anna olyan messze lakik, hogy nem látogat-hat-juk   meg.
          Anna so   far   lives that not visit-POSS-DEF.1PL PFX
          'Anna lives so far away that we can't visit her.'

      b.   Anna olyan soká-ig   olvasott, hogy el-aludt.
          Anna so   long-TER read   that PFX-slept.3SG
          'Anna was reading for so long that she fell asleep.'

      c.   Péter olyan gyors-an ír,   hogy fáj a   keze.
          Peter so   quick-ly writes that hurts the his.hand
          'Peter writes so fast that his hand begins to hurt.'

    As demonstrated in the examples, modifiers are placed in front of the adverbial, just like the anticipatory expressions introducing finite clauses, which as a rule follow the adverbial, or in fact all other constituents of the main clause itself.

1.2.4. Postpositional phrases

1.2.4.1. *Operational definition*

In section 1.2.1.3.1.2 we alluded to the difficulty of defining postpositional phrases. Below we will first differentiate two subtypes: "case-like" postpositions apparently have a noun phrase in nominative case, but in a syntactic sense they are much more like case suffixes, while from the point of view of morphology they are independent words. The other group, which will be called "real" postpositions, takes a noun phrase in an oblique case. Both subclasses belong to "core" postpositions, in contrast to "transitional" ones, which are in the process of changing from syntactic constructions to postpositions. We will now list the criteria relevant to determining them.

First of all postpositions differ from case suffixes in that they are independent words as evidenced by operations such as derivation or coordination. Postpositions, unlike case suffixes, can serve as the basis for the adjectival or attributive derivative affix *-i* (discussed in more detail in 1.2.5.2.7). In contrast to case suffixes, postpositions can have their NP arguments conjoined, and they can be coordinated themselves.

(235) a.   Péter (fölött) és   Anna fölött
           Peter above and Anna above
           'above Peter and (above) Anna'

      b.   Péter-*(től) és   Anná-tól
           Peter-ABL and Anna-ABL
           'from Peter and (from) Anna'

(236) a.   Péter fölött és   mögött
           Peter above and behind
           'above and behind Peter'

      b.   *Péter-től és   -hez
           Peter-ABL and ALL
           ca. 'from and to Peter'

   "Real" postpositions assign oblique case to the NP they govern.

(237)   Anna Péter-rel együtt   érkezett
           Anna Peter-INS together arrived
           'Anna arrived together with Peter.'

   A different set of observations, in turn, supports the view that "real" postpositions are like oblique case suffixes themselves. First, they do not assign any case to their NPs, rather they behave like case suffixes in NPs containing the "full" demonstrative. If they marked their NPs

nominative, as Marácz (1991) claims, they would not have to be repeated on the demonstrative like any case suffix, and indeed the oblique case assigned by the "real" postpositions to their NPs.

(238) a. az-zal   a   fiú-val
          that-INS the boy-INS
          'with that boy'

      b. a(z) *(fölött) a   fiú fölött
          that above   the boy above
          'above that boy'

      c. az *(-zal) a   fiú-val   együtt
          that-INS the boy-INS together
          'together with that boy'

When a personal pronoun and a referential NP are coordinated in a postpositional phrase, they again behave the same way as case-marked personal pronouns coordinated with referential NPs.

(239) a. vel-ed   és   Péter-rel
          INS-2SG and Peter-INS
          'with you and Peter'

      b. *te és   Péter-rel
          you and Peter-INS

(240) a. fölött-ed   és   Péter fölött
          above-2SG and Peter above
          'above you and Peter'

      b. *te és Péter fölött-(etek)
                              2PL

The person-marked form of the postposition in the (b) example serves to indicate that the ungrammaticality does not arise from a conflict of agreement; for example, coordinated subjects such as those in (240b) can have predicates marked for second person plural.

Real postpositions can take locative case suffixes, but case-like postpositions, *pace* Marácz (1991: 279), do not admit additional inflectional affixes – at least for a large class of speakers.

(241) a. a   ház-on   túl-ról
          the house-SUB beyond-DEL
          'from beyond the house'

      b. ?a ház   mögött-ről
          the house behind-DEL
          'from behind the house'

The ungrammatical form in the (b) example is even more unlikely because the simple postposition *mögül* 'from behind' may also lexically block the formation of such complex forms.

A further distinction can be made between "core" postpositions and syntactic phrases in a state of transition to become postpositions, which also relies on properties of person-marking. Whereas (a) core postpositions in construction with personal pronouns consist of a root, a locative suffix and a person-marker, which is by and large identical with the one on possessed nominals, (b) transitional postpositions have the latter two in reversed order, just as if they were "true" noun phrases.

(242) a. föl-ött-ed
          top-SUP-2SG
          'above you'

      b. szám-od-ra
          account-2SG-SUB
          'onto your account' = 'for you'

This again relates these postpositions to (a) cases, some of which happen to have similar pronominal forms, and distances them from (b) "real" postpositions, which cannot combine directly with personal pronouns, since they take case-marked personal pronouns just as they require case-marked NPs.

(243) a. bel-ől-ed
          inside-ELA-2SG
          'out of you'

      b. vel-ed   együtt/*együtt-ed
          INS-2SG together/together-2SG
          'together with you'

1.2.4.2–3. Arguments and modification of postpositional phrases

Although postpositions appear in construction with subordinate clauses, it is safe to say that they always and without exception take noun phrases as their arguments, as has been illustrated throughout. In case they are accompanied by clauses, the postposition takes as its complement either (a) an anticipatory pronoun or (b) what is apparently a relative pronoun, but even in this latter instance the construction is best regarded as idiosyncratic since the literal meaning of the relative pronoun + postposition is not present. Although it is classified as a conjunction, the postpositional phrase is understood as part of (the meaning of) the main clause, since it is within the higher clause that the time relator is interpretable.

(244) a.   Az-után, hogy Péter meg-érkezett, Anna el-aludt
           it-after   that   Peter PFX-arrived   Anna PFX-slept
           'After Peter had arrived, Anna fell asleep.'

      b.   Mi-után   Péter meg-érkezett, Anna el-aludt
           what-after Peter PFX-arrived   Anna PFX-slept
           'After Peter had arrived, Anna fell asleep.'

Apart from conjoined phrases, postpositions do not occur with more than
one argument, and they cannot be stranded either. The adverbs that can
modify postpositional phrases were discussed in the previous subsection.

1.2.4.4. Cases governed by postpositions

As was argued above, case-like postpositions do not govern cases but
behave like case affixes themselves. Their list is as follows: *által* 'by'; *alá*
'(to) under', *alatt* 'under', *alól* 'from under'; *elé* '(to) before', *előtt* 'before',
elől 'from before'; *ellen* 'against'; *felé* 'toward', *felől* 'from the direction of';
fölé '(to) above', *fölött* 'above'; *gyanánt* 'as'; *helyett* 'instead of'; *hosszat* 'for
(a period of time)'; *iránt* 'for'; *köré* '(to) around', *körül* 'around; *közé* '(to)
between', *között* 'between', *közül* 'from between'; *mellé* '(to) beside', *mellett*
'beside', *mellől* 'from beside'; *miatt* 'because of'; *mögé* '(to) behind', *mögött*
'behind', *mögül* 'from behind'; *nélkül* 'without'; *óta* 'since'; *szerint*
'according to'; *után* 'after'; *végett* 'for the sake of'.

   "Real" postpositions, on the other hand, appear to select between the
following cases: (a) superessive – *alul* 'below', *át* 'through, across', *belül*
'inside of', *felül* 'beyond, over', *keresztül* 'through, across', *kívül* 'outside
of', *túl* 'beyond', *végig* 'along'; (b) instrumental – *együtt* 'together', *szem-*
be(n) 'opposite to', *szemközt* 'facing'; (c) allative – *képest* 'compared to',
közel 'near'.

(245) a.   a   ház-on   át
           the house-SUP across
           'across the house'

      b.   Anná-val   szemben
           Anna-INS opposite
           'opposite to Anna'

      c.   Péter-hez   képest
           Peter-ALL compared
           'compared to Peter'

   Moreover, transitional postpositions may also govern oblique cases.

(246)   e   perc-től   fogva
           this minute-ABL beginning
           'from / since this minute'

A number of case-like postpositions (though definitely not all) can take personal pronouns as their arguments, whose most common form is, as was illustrated above, agreement marked on the postposition with the pronoun itself suppressed.

(247) a. fölött-ed
          above-2SG

      b. *gyanánt-ad
          as-2SG

The pronoun can be (a) overt inside the postpositional phrase or (b) it can move out if it assumes a dative case, much as in possessive noun phrases. Note that not all postpositions that can take personal pronouns as arguments allow them to leave the PP and that only personal pronouns are capable of undergoing this operation. It has been argued that when the nominal complement of the postposition is moved out of the PP, it is interpreted as metaphorical.

(248) a. Te-fölött-ed   senki   nincs.
          you-above-2SG nobody not.is
          'There is nobody above you.'
          'You have no superiors.'

      b. Nek-ed   senki   nincs fölött-ed.
          DAT-2SG nobody not.is above-2SG
          'You have no superiors.'

(249) a. Te-helyett-ed   Anna érkezett.
          you-instead-2SG Anna arrived
          'Anna arrived instead of you.'

      b. *Nek-ed   Anna érkezett helyett-ed.
          DAT-2SG Anna arrived instead-2SG

In another construction-type the postposition appears as if it were a preverbal prefix.

(250) a. Anna mellé Péter-t   állították.
          Anna beside Peter-ACC stood.3PL
          'They stood Peter next to Anna.'

      b. Mellé-állították   Péter-t   Anná-nak.
          beside-stood.3PL Peter-ACC Anna-DAT
          'They stood Peter next to Anna.'

      c. Anná-nak Péter-t állították mellé *(-je)
                                             beside-3SG
          'They stood Peter next to Anna.'

It is supposed, at least under some analyses (cf. Marácz 1991, É. Kiss 1994), that the postposition moves out of the postpositional phrase into the preverbal position, leaving the argument in a dative case. Others, e.g., Komlósy (1994), maintain that the two analogous constructions come from parallel, but not identical, sources, as is indicated by the differences in person-marking.

Other, more prefix-like postpositions can freely alternate between a person-marked and a plain form.

(251) a. A sín alá ütött.
the rail under hit.3SG
'He hit (once) under the rail.'

b. Alá-ütött a sín-nek.
rail-DAT
'He hit (once) under the rail.'

c. A sín-nek ütött alá(-ja).
under-3SG
'He hit (once) under the rail.'

Note here that nonpronominal NPs cannot in general be marked by the dative in postpositional phrases and that in the examples above focus was disregarded.

Finally, there are two postpositions that govern alternative cases; one of them has different meanings depending on the cases it assigns, the other can assign an oblique case to its argument only if it is a personal pronoun. The following illustrate.

(252) a. a körülmények-nél fogva
the circumstances-ADE because
'on account of the circumstances'

b. e perc-től fogva
this minute-ELA beginning
'from this minute'

(253) a. Péter(*-nél) nélkül
Peter-ADE without
'without Peter'

b. nál-ad nélkül
ADE-2SG without
'without you'

c. nélkül-ed
without-2SG
'without you'

Few verbs or lexical heads in general govern postpositions (e.g., *szeretet NP iránt* 'love for NP'), and none of them determines the case the postposition assigns to its argument.

1.2.5. Noun phrases

1.2.5.1. *Operational definition*

Noun phrases are determined by their syntactic positions: they can be subjects or objects, they can be marked for various oblique cases, and occur as arguments of postpositions. Although the nominal head of the NP, as well as the modifying adjectival phrase and the nominal head, may be omitted and then the plural and case affixes are attached to the remaining rightmost constituent of the NP, the identification of the string as a noun phrase encounters no difficulty.

(254) a.   Anna [négy alacsony férfi] ellen   győzött.
            Anna four   small   man against won
            'Anna has won against four small men.'

     b.   Anna [négy alacsony _] ellen győzött.
           'Anna has won against four small ones.'

     c.   Anna [négy _ _] ellen győzött.
           'Anna has won against four ones.'

1.2.5.2. *Modification*

1.2.5.2.1. Modification by adjective

Adjectives or, more precisely, adjectival phrases, occur to the left of the head noun. They do not agree with the head in number or in case. If there is more than one adjective, they may be conjoined or "stacked". In the latter case they can be interpreted as either restrictive or nonrestrictive and their order starting from the noun toward the "periphery" is determined on semantic grounds – i.e., the kinds of property they designate – adjectives expressing more central, stable, invariable features are closer to the noun than those conveying characteristics of a more temporary, changeable nature.

(255) a.   az idős és sikeres író

     b.   a   sikeres és   idős   író
           the old   and successful writer

     c.   a sikeres idős író
           'the successsful old writer'

    d.   *?az idős sikeres író
        'the old successful writer'

The groups of adjectives from "peripheral" to "central" are as follows:

(256)

Variable	Age/Size	Color	Source	Noun
sikeres	idős	fekete	amerikai	író
successful	old	black	American	writer
kedves	hosszú	barna	magyar	vizsla
kind	tall	brown	Hungarian	hound
szép	új	fehér	selyem	ing
beautiful	new	white	silken	shirt

Adjectives of the same group can of course also be stacked under the same conditions and with the same ambiguities between restrictive and non-restrictive readings.

(257) a.   a   sikeres   okos   vizsla
         the successful clever hound

      b.   ?*az okos sikeres vizsla

When the adjective has an argument, it has to be positioned to the left of the adjective.

(258) a.   a   [beszél-ni   képtelen] író
         the speak-INF unable   writer
         'the writer unable to speak'

      b.   *a képtelen beszél-ni író

      c.   *a képtelen író beszél-ni

(259) a.   a   házá-ra   büszke építész
         the his.house-SUB proud   architect
         'the architect proud of his house'

      b.   *a büszke házá-ra építész

The same ordering requirements apply to comparative constructions inside the noun phrase.

(260) a.   a   lányok-nál kedves-ebb fiúk
         the girls-ADE .kind-er   boys
         'the boys kinder than the girls'

      b.   *a kedves-ebb (a) lányok-nál fiúk

   Adjective phrases, much like numerals, can appear in apposition to the noun phrase they (ultimately) modify. These appositive modifiers can be placed either before or after the relevant NP and are marked for the same

case as the noun. Their use points to the missing partitive case or construction in Hungarian and is a function of topic–focus structure, to be discussed in 1.11.

(261) a.   *Vizslá-t*   Anna *barná-t*   vett.
           hound-ACC Anna brown-ACC bought
           'As for hounds, Anna bought brown ones.'

     b.   *Négy-et*   Anna *vizslá-t*   vett.
           four-ACC Anna hound-ACC bought
           'As for (buying) four (of something), Anna bought four hounds.'

1.2.5.2.2. Relative clause

Finite and nonfinite relative clauses can freely modify nouns in NPs; they were extensively discussed in 1.1.2.3.

1.2.5.2.3. Possessive adjectives

Grammatical tradition regards possessive constructions as "attributive", though not adjectival, and lumps them together with adjectival attributes surveyed above. However, they have nothing in common with the well-known possessive adjectives of, for example, a number of Slavic languages. The two structures they exhibit differ in the order of the possessor and the article and the case of the possessor. In Szabolcsi's (1986/1992, 1994) analysis, the possessor in (a), the "compact" possessive construction, has nominative and it has a definite article to its left, at least in some dialects, which do not otherwise allow an article in front of proper names. In (b), the "extended" construction, the possessor has dative case and the article is to its right. The discussion of the construction is deferred to section 1.10.

(262) a.   a   Péter   kalap-ja
           the Peter.NOM hat-POSS.3SG
           'Peter's hat'

     b.   Péter-nek a   kalap-ja
           Peter.DAT the hat-POSS.3SG
           'Peter's hat'

1.2.5.2.4. Articles

The definite article has two forms: *a* and *az*, depending on whether the following word starts with a consonant or a vowel. It is not declined and, except for the "extended" possessive construction, the quantifier *mind* 'all'

and demonstratives, it is always the leftmost constituent in the NP. The indefinite article *egy* is identical with the numeral 'one', and the only difference between them is that of stress and the simple (for the article) vs. geminate (for the numeral) palatal stop (rendered as *gy* in orthography).

1.2.5.2.5. Demonstratives

Demonstratives occur in two different positions and versions within the noun phrase: they can be (263) internal and undeclined for number and case, or (264) external and marked for number and case. In the first case they can be shown to be preceded by the definite article, e.g., in a possessive construction, while in the latter case they are followed by it. Both subtypes have a proximate and a nonproximate variety.

(263) a. az Anna ama/azon kalap-ja
          the Anna that   hat-POSS
          ca. 'that hat of Anna's'

    b. (*az) azon/ama kalap-(ok-(at))
          the that   hat-PL-ACC

    c. (*az) eme/ezen/e kalap-(ok-(at))
          the this   hat-PL-ACC

(264) a. ez-t/az-t   a kalap-ot
          this-ACC/that-ACC the hat-ACC

    b. *ez/az a kalap-ot

    c. ez-ek-et/az-ok-at   a kalap-ok-at
          this-PL-ACC/that-PL-ACC the hat-PL-ACC

The internal demonstrative can be preceded by the possessor NP (and then also by the article); all other modifiers follow it. The external demonstrative, in turn, cannot occur inside a possessive construction, as shown by the constituency test applying focussing. Note that the possessor can be outside the possessive NP, whether before or after it, making the NP with the external demonstrative acceptable.

(265) a. *Nem [Anná-nak az-t   a kalap-já-t]   látt-am.
          not Anna-DAT that-ACC the hat-POSS-ACC saw-DEF.1SG

    b. Anná-nak$_i$ nem [t_i az-t a kalap-já-t] látt-am.
          'It wasn't that hat of Anna's that I saw.'

Note, finally, that both the external and the internal demonstratives can occur in "compounds" formed of the quantifier *mind* 'all, every', or the prefix *ugyan-* 'same'.

(266) a. mind-azok a   kalap-ok
          all   those the hat-PL
          'all those hats'

      b. ugyan-ezek a   kalap-ok
          same   these the hat-PL
          'these same hats'

(267) a. Anna mind-azon kalap-ja-i   (amely-ek . . .)
          Anna all-that   hat-POSS-PL which-PL
          'all those hats of Anna's (which . . .)'

      b. Anna ugyan-azon kalap-ja (amely . . .)
          'the same hat of Anna's (which . . .)'

1.2.5.2.6. Numerals and quantifiers

Cardinal numerals, and by analogy quantifiers, occupy a position
between (internal) demonstratives and adjectives. As argued by Szabolcsi
(1994), while articles do not in general coocur with quantifiers, they can
be shown to be present simultaneously if there is some syntactic phrase
placed between them. Quantified phrases (including universally quanti-
fied ones) are syntactically indefinite, since they take the indefinite
conjugation, but the (c) example below requires definite conjugation if in
object position.

(268) a. ama négy fekete toll
          that four black pen
          'those four black pens'

      b. *a minden beszéd
          the every   speech

      c. a   [termen belüli] minden beszéd
          the room   inside every   speech
          'every speech inside the room'

Ordinal numerals usually precede cardinal numerals, and always follow
quantifiers.

(269) a. a harmadik négy fiú
          'the third four boys'

      b. minden negyedik fiú
          every   fourth   boy

Numerals are understood here as comprising optional "classifiers", i.e.,
measure words, such as *liter* 'liter', *kiló* 'kilo', *darab* 'piece', etc. For an
interesting survey, see Beckwith (1992).

1.2.5.2.7. Adverbials

There is no natural place inside the Hungarian noun phrase for adverbials. This conflict is resolved in the following ways.

(i) In nominative and accusative NPs it is possible for a (place or time) adverbial to follow the modified NP. This order is ungrammatical if the NP is in an oblique case.

(270) a.   A   könyv Ibsen-ről   jól   sikerült.
           the book   Ibsen-DEL well succeeded
           'The book about Ibsen was a success.'

      b.   A   könyv-et   a   kirakat-ban   Anna írta.
           the book-ACC the shop.window-INE Anna wrote.DEF
           'Anna wrote the book in the shop window.'

      c.   *A   könyv-ről a kirakat-ban Anna írt.
           the book-DEL
           'Anna wrote about the book in the shop window.'

(ii) Postpositional phrases can be "attributivized" through affixing the postposition by -i, a general adjectivalizer derivative affix. The resulting construction is then placed among the "peripheral" adjectives, to the left of the more central ones, and cannot be used predicatively. Note that only postpositions can undergo this process; the alternative strategy for oblique cases is discussed directly below.

(271) a.   a   polc mögött-i   könyv
           the shelf behind-ATTR book
           'the book behind the shelf'

      b.   *az Ibsen-ről-i   könyv
           Ibsen-ELA-ATTR

(iii) The adjectivalizer affix -i also has extensive use in turning unmarked locative expressions into attributes, or sometimes into straightforward adjectives. Any temporally or locatively interpretable noun, including all placenames, can be lexically converted into an adjective capable of occurring either in the noun phrase or the predicate.

(272) a.   a   budapest-i   lány
           the Budapest-ATTR girl
           'the girl from Budapest'

      b.   a   tegnap-i   újság
           the yesterday-ATTR paper
           'yesterday's paper'

   c.   az asztal-i   lámpa
        the table-ATTR lamp
        'the table lamp'

   d.   a   hav-i   előfizetés
        the month-ATTR subscription
        'the monthly subscription'

Note that these are positively not compounds in Hungarian, due to the affixation on the modifier. Moreover, as was alluded to above, most of them can serve as ordinary adjectives, although they are hardly gradable.

   (iv) Finally, oblique case-marked NPs can be turned into complex attributes by converting them into formally nonfinite active participial phrases by means of the general "dummy" *való* 'being', or other, semantically more or less bleached verbs like *történő* 'happening', *szóló* lit. 'speaking; concerned with'.

(273) a.   az Anná-val való/történő   találkozás
           the Anna-INS being/happening meeting
           'the meeting with Anna'

      b.   az Ibsen-ről szóló   könyv
           the Ibsen-ELA concerned book
           'the book about Ibsen'

1.2.5.2.8. Emphatic words

The paradigm identical with that of the reflexive pronoun is used for emphatic pronouns either in front of or following the noun phrase. When to the right of the head NP, they occasionally may be placed further away, though not beyond the focus (marked by bold type). Note that since focus has a particular syntactic position in Hungarian, the sentences containing emphatic words must have focus in them, though not necessarily on the emphatic word itself. The constructions are reminiscent of appositive constructions in that the case of the NP is reiterated on the emphatic pronoun.

(274) a.   Tegnap   **mag-á-val   Anná-val** találkoztam.
           yesterday self-3SG-INS Anna-INS met.1SG
           'Yesterday I met Anna herself.'

      b.   Anná-val magá-val **tegnap** találkoztam.
           'I met Anna herself **yesterday**.'

      c.   Én   Anná-val mindannyiszor **maga-m**   találkoztam.
           I.NOM   Anna-INS every-time   self-1SG.NOM met.1SG
           'I met Anna every time myself.'

Another set of words that can be characterized as emphatic are "focus-inducers", such as *csak* 'only', *kizárólag* 'exclusively', *egyedül* 'solely', and *nem* 'not', among others. If the NP, or for that matter any other phrase, is adjoined by them, they must move into the designated preverbal focus position and be interpreted accordingly. These focussing items are always placed to the left of the phrase.

(275) a.   Anna [csak az Ibsenről szóló   könyvet] olvasta.
           Anna only the Ibsen.ELA concerned book.ACC read
           'Anna has read only the book about Ibsen.'

      b.   Anna [nem az Ibsenről szóló   könyvet] olvasta.
           Anna not the Ibsen.ELA concerned book.ACC read
           'What Anna read was not the book about Ibsen.'

1.2.5.2.9. Comparative, superlative, and equative structures

The section on degree clauses (1.1.2.4.2.7) discussed the main types of comparative and equative structures; we now survey their properties in relation to NPs, but see also sections 1.8 and 1.9.

Equative structures are generally introduced by the pro-adverbial *olyan* 'such' and have the complementizer *mint* 'as'. When they lack the "pointer" *olyan*, they can be interpreted as nonrestrictive. The distinction is not very well borne out in the English translation; it hinges on whether or not the (elliptic) clause introduced by *mint* is a necessary or just an incidental constituent, to be omitted at leisure.

(276) a.   az olyan unalmas emberek, mint Anna
           the such boring people   as   Anna
           'boring people like Anna' = 'people boring to the extent to which Anna is boring'

      b.   az unalmas emberek, mint (például) Anna
           'boring people, like (for example) Anna'

Comparative structures come in two versions: (a) if the comparison is within the NP, the case-marked standard has to be used; (b) if there is a clause expressing the standard, it has to occur outside the NP.

(277) a.   Anná-nál   unalmas-abb emberek
           Anna-ADE boring-CMP people
           'people more boring than Anna'

      b.   unalmas-abb emberek, mint (amilyen) Anna
           boring-CMP people   than what   Anna
           'people more boring than Anna'

The same distinction applies to quantitative comparisons.

(278) a. a   franciá-k-nál   több ember
          the French-PL-ADE more man
          'more people than the French'

    b. több ember, mint (amennyien) a   franciák (vannak)
          more man   than as.many   the French are
          'more people than the French'

The superlative construction is invariably introduced by the definite article, with the comparative suffix following and the superlative prefix preceding the quantifier or adjective marked.

(279) a. a   leg-unalmas-abb előadás
          the SPR-boring-CMP lecture
          'the most boring lecture'

    b. a   leg-több ember
          the SPR-more man
          'the most people'

For more discussion, see section 1.9.

1.2.5.2.10. Noun complement clauses

A number of nouns may be lexically specified for clausal complements, i.e., the equivalent of *that*-clauses in English. Strictly speaking, they are not modifiers, since, unlike in the case of, e.g., an adjectival modifier, the head noun must be lexically specified for the possibility of being complemented by a clause. The noun may also determine whether the clause is (a) indicative, (b) interrogative, or (c) whether its predicate is in the subjunctive/imperative. (See Molnár 1982 for an overview.)

(280) a. Érdekes   az állítás, hogy Anna tanul.
          interesting the claim that Anna studies
          'The claim that Anna is studying is interesting.'

    b. Érdekes   a   kérdés, hogy Anna tanul-e.
          interesting the question that   Anna studies-Q
          'The question whether Anna is studying is interesting.'

    c. Érdekes   a   kérés, hogy Anna tanul-j-on.
          interesting the request that   Anna study-SUBJ-3SG
          'The request for Anna to study is interesting.'

We note here that although infinitives do occur in (a) event nominals, i.e., the type of nominalizations that in Grimshaw's (1990) sense preserve the argument structure of the verb, other types of nouns (b) do not take infinitival complements, even if they are derived from verbs with infinitival

arguments. In this case the corresponding noun can take an oblique case-marked complement (c).

(281) a. Anna olvas-ni   akar-ás-a   érdekes.
        Anna read-INF want-NML-POSS interesting
        'Anna's wish to read is interesting.'

    b. Anna (*olvas-ni) vágy-a   érdekes.
        Anna read-INF   desire-POSS interesting
        'Anna's desire (to read) is interesting.'

    c. Anna vágy-a   az olvas-ás-ra   érdekes.
        Anna desire-POSS the read-NML-SUB interesting
        'Anna's desire for reading is interesting.'

1.2.5.3–5. Order of modifiers

Below a summary is given of the observations relating to the relative order of various structures of modification within the noun phrase reviewed above. Since the order of adjectives was discussed in 1.2.5.2.1, only the order of the items arranged in the subsection is discussed here.

As has been seen, demonstratives are not in complementary distribution with articles, cf. (a); it is the (nominative or dative) possessor noun phrase that they exclude from their own noun phrase, cf. (b). When, however, the possessor noun phrase is in the dative, it can be placed outside the possessive NP and then the external demonstrative is grammatical, cf. (c). The evidence that the dative possessor is not inside the NP comes from focussed constructions illustrated in 1.2.5.2.5.

(282) a. az-t   a   kalap-ot
        that-ACC the hat-ACC
        'that hat'

    b. *[Péter (-nek) az-t   a   kalap-já-t]
        Peter   -DAT that-ACC the hat-POSS-ACC

    c. Péter-nek . . . [az-t a kalap-já-t]
        'that hat of Peter's'

It then stands to reason to assume that external demonstratives and possessors occupy the same positions in the noun phrase. The rest of the premodifiers are lined up in the following schematic order.

(283)   External
         demonstrative   Definite   Nominative
                                                   Attribute
         Dative   Article   Possessive NP
         Possessive NP

         Quantifier   Internal   Numeral   Adjective   NOUN
                      demonstrative

Obviously, positional versions of the same constituent exclude each other: no external demonstrative can cooccur with an internal one, and no dative possessor NP can be followed by a nominative one – multiple possessive constructions are left-branching structures *within* a possessor NP.

By "attributes" we understand the adverbial premodifiers discussed 1.2.5.2.7, in particular the postpositional and complex ones, which can be optionally placed to the left of the quantifiers, but they can equally well appear in the position of adjectives.

1.3. COORDINATION

1.3.1. Types of coordination

1.3.1.1. Coordinating devices

Following Dik (1968) and Bánréti (1994), we differentiate between n-ary and binary means for coordinating sentences and constituents, depending on whether they take an unlimited number of conjuncts or just two. The three n-ary conjunctions – *és*, *meg* 'and', as well as *vagy* 'or' – resemble each other in that they are all "central", that is, they occur between the two conjuncts, unlike "right-shifted" ones, which appear to the right of the first topicalized phrase in the second conjoined clause. Finally, coordinators may also differ as to whether or not they have to occur in each conjunct, i.e., whether or not they are correlative.

1.3.1.1.1. And-coordination

The general coordinating conjunction is *és* and its shorter version *s*. The coordinator *meg* is also used in the sense of 'and'; *meg* has to be central if interpreted as 'and'-conjunction; *pedig* has to be right-shifted in the same reading.

(284) a.   Péter olvas *és*   Anna tanul.
           Peter reads and Anna studies

      b.   Péter olvas, *meg* Anna tanul.

      c.   Péter olvas, Anna *pedig* tanul.
           'Peter is reading and Anna is studying.'

1.3.1.1.2. But-coordination

Conjunctions expressing contrast are never n-ary, and a large number of them are optionally or obligatorily right-shifted. The two most frequent ones are *de* and *azonban*. The contrast between *meg* and *pedig* seen above is preserved here in opposite positions: *meg* is right-shifted and *pedig* is central. (For more on *pedig*, see 1.3.1.1.4.)

(285) a. Péter olvas, *de/pedig*   Anna tanul.
      Peter reads but/in turn Anna studies

   b. Péter olvas, *azonban/viszont/ellenben*   Anna tanul.
                   however/in-turn/on-the-other-hand

   c. Péter olvas, Anna *azonban/viszont/ellenben* tanul.

   d. Péter olvas, Anna *meg* tanul.
      'Peter is reading, but/in turn Anna is studying.'

   Contrast with a negative first conjunct also makes use of *de* or *azonban* if the entire proposition is involved. For contrasting constituents, which is to be discussed in 1.11, *hanem* 'but' is applied. *De* and *hanem* are not interchangeable in these positions.

(286) a. Péter nem olvas, *de/azonban* Anna tanul.
      'Peter is not reading, but Anna is studying.'

   b. Péter nem a   szobában olvas, *hanem* a   kertben.
      Peter not the room.INE reads but   the garden-INE
      'Peter is reading not in the room, but in the garden.'

1.3.1.1.3. Or-coordination

The most common coordinator is the central *vagy* 'or'. Although it is usually understood as expressing alternatives (rather than "logically" allowing for all/both conjuncts to be true simultaneously), when one alternative is meant to exclude (all) the other(s), it ceases to be a central conjunction, since it is repeated at the beginning of each conjunct.

(287) a. Péter olvas vagy Anna tanul.
      'Peter is reading or Anna is studying.'

   b. Vagy Péter olvas, vagy Anna tanul.
      'Either Peter is reading, or Anna is studying.'

A somewhat different (and more archaic) version of the central conjunction is *avagy*. Alternatives in a concessive clause are introduced by the correlative coordinator *akár . . . akár* 'whether . . . or'.

(288) Akár Péter olvas, akár Anna tanul, szól a rádió.
        whether Peter reads or   Anna studies speaks the radio
        'Whether Peter is reading or Anna is studying, the radio is on.'

1.3.1.1.4. Other coordinators

In agreement with Bánréti (1994), two more classes of coordinators are distinguished here. One is used to express an inference relation between the two conjuncts, the other the speaker's contradictory expectations as regards the first conjunct. These shades of meaning are difficult to render in English by means of the single conjunctions of reason and contrast *so* and *but*, respectively.

(289) a. Anna tanul, *tehát/ezért* nem szól a rádió.
            Anna studies so   not speaks the radio
            'Anna is studying, so the radio is not on.'

   b. Nem szól a rádió, *ugyanis* Anna tanul.
        'The radio is not on, for Anna is studying.'

(290) a. Anna tanul, *holott/pedig* szól a rádió.
            Anna studies but/although speaks the radio
            'Anna is studying, but the radio is on.'

   b. Szól a rádió, Anna *mégis* tanul.
        'The radio is on, still/even so Anna is studying.'

1.3.1.2. Number of coordinators

Each of the n-ary coordinators *és, meg* 'and', *vagy* 'or' can be placed between the other conjunct clauses in addition to their obligatory position between the last pair – if and only if they occur between every pair of clauses. That is, once they are placed between any other than the last pair of clauses, they have to appear between all pairs. While the insertion of these conjunctions does not lead to ungrammaticality, the sentences are far better if the coordinators appear between the last two conjuncts only.

By definition the binary conjunctions can (and have to) occur only between the two clauses concerned. All of these coordinators differ from the correlative conjunctions, which have to appear in each conjunct. One such example (*akár . . . akár*) was discussed in the previous section.

Other correlative coordinators are the affirmative *is . . . is* 'also', historically related to *és* 'and', or the negative *sem . . . sem* 'neither . . . nor', which may involve negative concord, a frequent phenomenon in Hungarian, often referred to by the misnomer "multiple negation".

(291) a.   Péter is   olvas, (és) Anna is   tanul.
           Peter also reads and Anna also studies
           'Peter is reading and Anna is also studying.'

      b.   Péter sem olvas, (és) Anna sem tanul.
           'Peter is not reading, nor is Anna studying.'

      c.   Sem   Péter nem olvas, sem Anna nem tanul.
           neither Peter not reads nor Anna not   studies
           'Peter is not reading, nor is Anna studying.'

1.3.1.3–5. Coordination of constituents

In general, though not without exceptions, only the n-ary coordinators *és*, *meg* 'and', *vagy* 'or' can occur within syntactic constituents, and even if correlative coordinators are also possible, their status as coordinators of constituents (rather than of elliptic clauses) is doubtful, since they cannot form a single constituent out of the conjoined items.

(292) a.   Anna (is) olvas, és Péter is   (olvas).
           Anna also reads and Peter also reads
           'Anna is reading and Peter, too, is reading.'

      b.   Anna is, Péter is olvas.
           'Anna is reading and Peter, too, is reading.'

(293) a.   Anná-t   nem/sem láttam,   és Péter-t   sem
           Anna-ACC not   saw.DEF.1SG and Peter-ACC nor

           (láttam).
           saw.DEF.1SG
           'I didn't see Anna, nor (did I see) Peter.'

      b.   Sem Anná-t, sem Péter-t nem láttam.
           'I saw neither Anna nor Peter.'

As is well-known, the identity of the syntactic categories of the constituent is a necessary, but not sufficient condition of coordination. The only apparent exception to this generalization is found in question-word questions, but, according to Bánréti (1992), these are undoubtedly instances of elliptic clausal coordination.

(294) a.   *Anna és   könyv-et   olvasott tegnap.
           Anna and book-ACC read   yesterday

      b.   Ki   és mi-t   olvasott tegnap?
           who and what-ACC read   yesterday
           'Who read yesterday and what (did s/he read)?'

The condition of categorial identity is not sufficient because the conjoined constituents not only have to be of the same class or carry the same suffixes, but they also have to assign or have to be assigned identical thematic roles. In fact, for instance in the case of place adverbials, it is the identity of the semantic relationship that matters notwithstanding the affixes proper.

(295) a. *Anna bámul és   hasonlít   Péter-re.
           Anna stares and resembles Peter-SUB

b. *Anna ismeri és   üti   Péter-t.
    Anna   knows and beats Peter-ACC

c. *Péter régi-nek és   Anná-nak tartja   a   lámpá-t.
    Peter old-DAT and Anna-DAT hold.DEF.3SG the lamp-ACC
    'Peter considers the lamp old/holds the lamp for Anna.'

d. A   könyvek az asztalon és   a   székek mögött vannak.
    the books   the table-SUP and the chairs behind are
    'The books are on the table and behind the chairs.'

With these caveats in mind, identical syntactic categories can be coordinated without difficulty. The accepted constituency test in Hungarian is based on the observation that focussed items must be single constituents. Although the test itself is not illustrated here in each case, its application has supported our claims throughout.

The first set of examples for coordination is drawn from NPs. They show (a) NPs, (b) external demonstratives, (c) dative possessor NPs, (d) nominative possessor NPs, (e) numerals, (f) adjectives, and (g) nouns.

(296) a. Tegnap   [Anna és   Péter] olvasott.
           yesterday Anna and Peter read.3SG
           'Yesterday Anna and Peter were reading.'

b. Anna [[ezeket   és azokat]   a   könyveket] olvasta.
    Anna these.ACC and those.ACC the books.ACC read.DEF.3SG
    'Anna has read these and those books.'

c. Tegnap   [[Anná-nak és   Péter-nek] a   könyv-e-i-t]
    yesterday Anna-DAT and Peter-DAT the book-POSS-PL-ACC

    olvastam.
    read.DEF.1SG
    'Yesterday I read Anna's and Peter's books.'

d. Tegnap [[Anna és Péter] könyv-e-i-t olvastam.
    'Yesterday I read Anna's and Peter's books.'

e. Anna [ezt   a [három vagy négy] könyv-et]
    Anna this.ACC the three   or   four book-ACC

    olvasta.
    read.DEF.3SG
    'Anna has read these three or four books.'

f. Péter [[hosszú vagy érdekes]   könyvek-et] olvas.
    Peter long   or   interesting books-ACC reads
    'Peter reads long or interesting books.'

g. Anna [ezt   a három [könyv-et vagy folyóirat-ot]]
    Anna this.ACC the three   book-ACC or   journal-ACC

    olvasta.
    read.DEF.3SG
    'Anna has read these three books or journals.'

The coordination of verb phrases per se is either questionable or impos-
sible to illustrate for the following reasons: (a) in finite clauses, what
appears to be VP-coordination is based on the absence of the subject,
which may be due to the suppression of the subject pronoun; (b) in non-
finite structures, on the other hand, coordination may well operate on
the entire infinitival or participial clause, whose subject is missing by
definition.

(297) a. Anna [[olvassa a   könyvet] és [hallgatja   a
          Anna reads.DEF the book.ACC and listens.DEF the

          rádiót]]
          radio.ACC
          'Anna is reading the book and is listening to the radio.'

      b. Anna igyekszik [[olvas-ni a könyvet] és [hallgat-ni a rádiót]]
              strives   read-INF   listen-INF
          'Anna strives to read the book and listen to the radio.'

Verbs, however, can be conjoined, provided their thematic structures are
identical, as was pointed out above.

(298) a. Anna ismeri   és szereti   Péter-t.
          Anna knows.DEF and likes.DEF Peter-ACC
          'Anna knows and likes Peter.'

      b. Mi bízunk és   hiszünk bennetek.
          we trust   and believe in-you
          'We trust and believe in you.'

Various semantic subclasses of adverbials of manner and purpose can also
be coordinated, but place and time adverbials must belong to separate

constituents. In general, adverbials that can cooccur without coordination cannot be conjoined. This is illustrated by an illicit conjunction of a sentence adverbial with a manner adverb.

(299) a. Anna megbízhatóan és magas fizetés-ért dolgozott.
      Anna reliably   and high   salary-CAU worked
      'Anna worked reliably and for a high salary.'

    b. *Péter tegnap   és London-ban dolgozott.
       Peter   yesterday and London-INE worked

    c. Anna szerencsére (*és) gyorsan olvas.
      Anna fortunately and fast   reads
      'Anna reads fast (and) fortunately.'

    The coordination of adjectives with active and passive participial constructions is illustrated below in (a) and (b), respectively, and that of nouns and (result) nominalizations in (c). Event nominalizations cannot be conjoined with lexical nouns, see (d). For the distinction arising from the difference of the attributive affix -i, which defines result nominals, and *való*, which determines event nominals, see Szabolcsi (1994).

(300) a. a [[gyorsan olvas-ó]   és értelmes] diákok
      the fast   read-APRT and smart   students
      'the fast reading and smart students'

    b. a [[tegnap olvas-ott] vagy unalmas] könyvek
      the yesterday read-PPRT or   boring   books
      'the books read yesterday or which are boring'

    c. Anna [előadás-a   és [ebéd után-i   felszólal-ás-a]]
      Anna lecture-POSS and lunch after-ATTR present-NML-POSS
      'Anna's lecture and presentation [result] after lunch'

    d. *Anna [előadás-a és [ebéd után való   felszólal-ás-a]]
                                being
      'Anna's lecture and presentation [event] after lunch'

    The last configuration to be mentioned here is the coordination of first constituents of compounds.

(301) a. cipő- és   csizma-javítás
      shoe and boot   repair

    b. három- és négy-láb-ú asztalok
      three- and four-leg-ged tables

    Although the means of coordination and the expression of accompaniment are not the same, in one instance they are interchangeable. When the (human) subject is a coordinated NP, there is an alternative device

available, viz., using one of the conjuncts as subject, and the other in a comitative expression marked by the usual comitative suffix (glossed as "COM" below), which is identical with the instrumental case suffix. In case of a pronominal subject, often the plural is used instead of the singular.

(302) a. A fiúk a   lányok-kal olvasnak.
the boys the girls-INS   read.3PL
'The boys and the girls are reading.'

b. Anná-val   olvas-t-uk   a   könyvet.
Anna-COM read-PAST-1PL the book.ACC
'Anna and I have read the book.'

Finally, the exceptional conjunction in the coordination of constituents has to be mentioned here. The n-ary conjunctions can coordinate an unlimited number of items without respect to their semantic relationship. Some binary conjunctions, on the other hand, can indicate contrast, especially between adjectives (or attributes) and adverbials, respectively.

(303) a. az [érdekes, de hosszú] könyvek
the interesting but long   books

b. Anna [megbízhatóan, viszont kis   fizetésért]   dolgozik
Anna reliably   but   small salary.CAU works
'Anna works reliably, but for a small salary.'

1.3.2. Omission of constituents

As Bánréti (1992, 1994) has argued, the omission of constituents is governed by structural properties, in particular, whether the sentence is focussed or neutral. If the parallelism of the two clauses obtains, everything can be deleted following the last focussed (i.e., heavily accented) preverbal operator, which can be either a quantifier or a contrastive focus. (Contrastive focus is indicated by bold type; parallel structures are shown by the vertical arrangement of identical constituents and the omitted constituent by dots in brackets. For more on focus, see 1.11.)

(304)   Anna   minden könyvet   el-olvasott tegnap,
Anna   every   book.ACC PFX-read   yesterday

Péter pedig minden levelet   [. . .]
Peter and   every   letter.ACC
'Anna read every book yesterday, and Peter read every letter yesterday.'

(305) a. Anna   **a könyvet** olvasta   tegnap   a kertben,
          Anna   the book.ACC read.DEF yesterday the garden.INE

          Péter pedig **a levelet**   [. . .]
          Peter in-turn the letter.ACC
          'Anna read the book yesterday, and Peter the letter.'

      b. Anna   **tegnap**   olvasta a könyvet,
          Péter pedig **ma**   [. . .]
          'Anna read the book yesterday, and Peter today.'

If the first clause has a negated focussed constituent, then everything apart from the focus may delete from the second clause. In this case no different constituents can appear to the left of the focus, unlike the positive case above.

(306) a. Nem **a könyvet** olvasta   Anna tegnap   a kertben,
          Anna the book.ACC read.DEF Anna yesterday the garden.INE

          hanem **a levelet**   [. . .]
          but   the letter.ACC
          'It's not the book but the letter that Anna read yesterday in the garden.'

      b. Anna nem   **tegnap** olvasta a könyvet,
          (*Péter) hanem **ma**   [. . .]
          'It's not yesterday that Anna read the book, but today.'

It is in this group of ellipsis that some of the correlative constructions discussed in the previous section belong: *is* 'too, also', and *sem* 'neither, nor' behave like operators and induce the omission of identical constituents. They differ from the construction immediately above in that omission here may extend to the focussed item.

(307) a. Anna **tegnap**   olvasta a   könyvet,
          Anna yesterday read   the book.ACC
          és   Péter is   [. . .]
          and Peter too
          'Anna read the book yesterday, and so did Peter.'

      b. Tegnap   nem a **könyvet** olvasta   Anna,
          yesterday not the book.ACC read.DEF Anna
          és   ma   sem   [. . .]
          and today neither
          'Anna didn't read the book yesterday, nor did she read it today.'

The correlative *is*, like its nonclitic counterpart *szintén* 'too', which carries heavy accent, especially in elliptic constructions, can also occur in neutral coordination with ellipsis in the second clause.

(308) a.   Anna elolvasta a   könyvet   tegnap,   és   Péter is/szintén.
Anna read.DEF the book.ACC yesterday and Peter too
'Anna read the book yesterday, and Peter, too, read it yesterday.'

b.   Anna elolvasta a könyvet tegnap, és   a   levelet
and the letter.ACC

is/szintén.
too
'Anna read the book yesterday, and the letter, too.'

Another variety of focussed ellipsis is to omit all the identical post-verbal material from the first, rather than from the second conjunct, as has been illustrated so far.

(309) a.   Anna   **a   könyvet**   [. . .],
Anna   the book.ACC
Péter pedig **a   levelet**   olvasta   a   kertben.
Peter in-turn the letter.ACC read.DEF the garden.INE
'Anna read the book, and Peter the letter, in the garden.'

b.   A   kertben   nem   **a   könyvet**   [. . .],
the garden.INE not   the book.ACC
hanem **a   levelet**   olvasta   Anna.
but   the letter.ACC read.DEF Anna
'In the garden Anna read not the book, but the letter.'

As was mentioned in connection with the structure of the NP in 1.2.5.1, numerals and adjectives can appear as elliptic NPs. This property is evidenced in coordinate constructions, as well.

(310) a.   Péter **négy** könyv-et   olvasott,
Peter four book-ACC read
Anna meg **hat-ot**   [. . .]
Anna and   six-ACC
'Peter has read four books, and Anna six ones.'

b.   Anna   az **érdekes**   könyv-et   olvasta,
Anna   the interesting   book-ACC read.DEF
Péter pedig   az **unalmas-at** [. . .]
Peter in-turn the boring-ACC
'Anna has read the interesting book, and Peter the boring one.'

If, however, the ellipsis is at work in the first clause, the numeral or the adjective must not be case-marked, but the identical constituents are simply omitted.

(311) a. Péter   **négy** [. . .],
         Anna meg **hat**   könyv-et olvasott.
         'Peter has read four books, and Anna six.'

     b. Anna   az **érdekes** [. . .],
         Péter pedig az **unalmas** könyv-et olvasta.
         'Anna has read the interesting book, and Peter the boring one.'

The deletion under identity can only involve immediate constituents of the noun phrase; constituents of constituents cannot be affected.

When the adjective phrases are in the predicate, the different intensifiers may also lead to ellipsis. This is not available for adjectives inside the noun phrase.

(312)   A könyv   **nagyon** [. . .],
         the book   very

         a   levél viszont   csak **kissé** unalmas volt.
         the letter however only little boring   was
         'The book was very boring, but the letter was only a little boring.'

Owing to the structure of ellipsis in Hungarian, even postpositions may be missing from the first conjunct.

(313)   Anna   a **könyv** [. . .],
         Anna   the book

         Péter pedig a   **levél** alatt   talált egy kulcsot.
         Peter and   the letter under found a   key.ACC
         'Anna found a key under the book, and Peter, under the letter.'

1.4. NEGATION

1.4.1. Sentence negation

In sentence negation, the negation elements *nem, ne* must occur in front of the finite or nonfinite verb.

(314) a. Anna nem olvassa   a   könyv-et.
         Anna not   reads.DEF the book-ACC
         'Anna is not reading the book.'

     b. [a [könyv-et   nem olvas-ó]   diákok]
         the book-ACC not   read-APRT students
         'the students not reading books'

c. [Ezt   a   könyv-et   nem olvas-ni] butaság volt.
this.ACC the book-ACC not   read-INF silliness was
'It was silly not to read this book.'

Ne differs from *nem* in that it is required in imperatives and subjunctives and cannot occur in any other modality.

(315)   Ne olvas-d   a   könyvet!
not read-2SG the book.ACC
'Don't read the book.'

The preverbal position of the negation word is maintained even in focussed clauses; it is the only item that can occur between a focussed phrase and the finite verb.

(316)   Anna a **könyvet**   nem olvasta.
Anna the book.ACC not   read.DEF
'It's the book that Anna hasn't read.'

When the additive-correlative clitic *is* is combined with either negation word, they are amalgamated into the single phonological words *sem* and *se*, historically derived from *is* 'also' + *ne(m)* 'not', appropriately illustrating the meaning of the combined form, too.

(317) a. Anna a   könyv-et   sem olvasta.
Anna the book-ACC nor read
'Anna hasn't read the book either.' = 'In addition to other things, the book also belongs to the set of objects Anna hasn't read.'

b. A   könyv-et   se olvas-d!
the book-ACC not read-IMP.DEF.2SG
'Don't read the book either!'

One subcase of sentence negation is negation of the nominal or adjectival predicate in copular sentences without an overt copula (see 1.2.1.1). Since they have no verbs, the negation word must occur before the nominal or adjectival predicate.

(318) a. Anna nem (volt) diák.
Anna not was   student
'Anna is/was not a student.'

b. Péter nem (volt) unalmas.
Peter not was   boring
'Peter is/was not boring.'

When the nominal predicate contains a measure expression, negation can have two versions: (a) if the measure word (in focus) is negated, it means

that there is either more or less of the item quantified by the measure expression; (b) if the copula is negated, the construction means that there is less of the denoted quantity.

(319) a.   Péter nem száz   kiló volt.
           Peter not hundred kilo was
           'Peter wasn't a hundred kilos (= he was more, or less).'

      b.   Péter nem volt száz kiló.
           'Peter was less than a hundred kilos.'

Wherever the copula has to occur in the third person in present tense, the positive form *van(nak)* 'is' has the suppletive negative counterpart *nincs(en)* 'not-is' and *nincsenek* 'not-are'.

(320) a.   Péter nincs száz   kiló.
           Peter not-is hundred kilo
           'Peter isn't a hundred kilos (= he is less).'

      b.   A   diákok   nincsenek az iskolá-ban.
           the students not-are   the school-INE
           'The students are not in the school.'

1.4.2. Constituent negation

Although it seems to be unproblematic to claim that whenever the negation word is placed in front of any constituent other than the verb, we have to do with constituent negation, this would be a spurious generalization.

First of all, if the sentence contains a universal quantifier, it must be negated by the negation word placed in front of the quantifier, rather than preverbally, thus in this case apparent constituent negation amounts to sentence negation.

(321) a.   *Mindenki nem olvasta   a   könyvet.
            everyone   not   read.DEF the book.ACC
            'Everyone didn't read the book.'

      b.   Nem mindenki olvasta a könyvet.
           'Not everyone has read the book.'

If the negation of the focussed constituent is constituent negation, then pre-focus negation belongs here. In another sense, however, such sentences are the negative counterparts of the corresponding affirmative focussed propositions, thus they do not realize constituent negation proper.

(322) a. Anna **a kert-ben**   olvasta   a könyvet.
          Anna the garden-INE read.DEF the book.ACC
          'It's in the garden that Anna read the book.'

b. Anna nem **a kert-ben** olvasta a könyvet.
    'It's not in the garden that Anna read the book.'

On the other hand, if focus negation were sentence negation, then negative polarity items, which are always triggered by sentence negation, could appear in these sentences, too.

(323) a. Anna nem olvasott semmi-t.
          Anna not read   nothing-ACC
          'Anna didn't read anything.'

b. *Anna nem **a kert-ben** olvasott semmi-t.

c. Anna **a kert-ben** nem olvasott semmi-t.
    'It's in the garden that Anna didn't read anything.'

d. Anna nem **a kert-ben** nem olvasott semmi-t.
    'It's not in the garden that Anna didn't read anything.'

We conclude at this point that, of the two negation elements, the one occurring in front of focus is a realization of constituent negation and the one in front of the verb is an instance of sentence negation.

1.4.3. Negative concord and multiple negation

As was illustrated immediately above, it is possible to have more than one negative element in a single clause and, depending on the items and the arrangements, the sentence may be negative or may ultimately come down as positive.

The latter case obtains in case of focus negation coupled with preverbal negation. The last example in the previous section is compatible with a positive reading, viz., that Anna did read something in the garden, even though it does not assert this proposition. Interaction between focus and negation results in a positive reading in other instances as well. In the following example the universal negative polarity item *senki* 'no one' is followed by a negated focus, and the resulting reading is identical with a universally quantified positive proposition.

(324)   Senki sem **ezt a   könyvet**   olvasta.
         no one not this the book.ACC read
         'No one has read **this** book.' = 'Everyone has read a book other than this one.'

Negative concord, which is often mistakenly called "multiple negation", is a pervasive feature of Hungarian. It extends over two kinds of

structure. In the first one, the additive clitic *is* 'also' occurs in a negative sentence and is changed into its negative counterpart *se(m)* 'neither, nor'. If the constituent marked by the clitic is (a) preverbal, preverbal *sem* serves as the only negation element in the sentence. If it is (b) postverbal, the negation element *nem* 'not' has to occur in its general preverbal position, and the constituent itself is marked by *se(m)*.

(325) a. Anna sem   olvasa a   könyvet.
          Anna neither read   the book.ACC
          '(In addition to others,) Anna, too, didn't read the book.'

      b. Nem olvasta a könyvet Anna sem.
          '(In addition to others,) Anna, too, didn't read the book.'

If more than one item is additively negated in a single constituent, either (a) a simple coordination with a final clitic *sem* is used, or (b) each conjunct has its own negative clitic, or (c) *sem* occurs in front of each conjunct as a correlative additive negation word with obligatory clausemate preverbal negation. If (d) the additively negated phrase is postverbal, preverbal negation is necessary in each alternative, of which only one is illustrated here. As before, except for the simple coordination in (a), the status of the conjoined items as parts of a single constituent is doubtful; for more, see the next section.

(326) a. Richárd, Anna és   Péter sem olvasa   a   könyvet.
          Richard, Anna and Peter nor read.DEF the book.ACC
          'Neither Richard, nor Anna, nor Peter has read the book.'
          (On one reading. The other reading is 'Richard, Anna, and Peter
          are also among those that haven't read the book.')

      b. *unambiguous*
          Richárd sem, Anna sem, Péter sem olvasa a könyvet.
          'Neither Richard, nor Anna, nor Peter has read the book.'

      c. *unambiguous*
          Sem Richárd, sem Anna, sem Péter nem olvasa a könyvet.
          'Neither Richard, nor Anna, nor Peter has read the book.'

      d. *unambiguous*
          Nem olvasta a könyvet sem Richárd, sem Anna, sem Péter.
          'Neither Richard, nor Anna, nor Peter has read the book.'

The other context for negative concord is provided by universal negative polarity items (UNPIs) like *senki* 'nobody', *semmi* 'nothing', etc. They all require clausemate preverbal negation, and since they optionally combine with the negative counterpart of the additive clitic *is*, a regularity similar to what was seen above is in force. That is, when the universal negative polarity item is (a) preverbal, either the general negation word

nem 'not' or its version incorporating the additive clitic *is*, i.e., *se(m)*, has to occur. If it is (b) postverbal, *nem* is the only choice preverbally, and the UNPI can be followed by an optional clitic *se(m)*. Cf. also Toth (forthcoming).

(327) a.   Anna semmi-t   sem/nem olvasott.
           Anna nothing-ACC not   read
           'Anna hasn't read anything.'

    b.   Anna nem olvasott semmit (sem).
           'Anna hasn't read anything.'

Multiple UNPIs observe the same rule: they can be arranged both preverbally and postverbally in a single clause, and if at least one of them occurs preverbally the negation word can take the form *sem*.

(328) a.   Senki   soha sem/nem olvasott semmi-t.
           No one never not   read   nothing-ACC
           'No one has ever read anything.'

    b.   Senki sem/nem olvasott soha semmit (sem).
           'No one has ever read anything.'

    c.   Nem olvasott senki soha semmit (sem).
           'No one has ever read anything.'

1.4.4. Negation in coordination

As was mentioned in 1.3.1.3–5, correlative negative coordinators do not, beyond all doubt, form a single constituent out of the conjoined phrases. The difficulty encountered in ascertaining the constituency of such conjunctions originates in the prohibition against focussing them, focus being the only position in which constituency can be tested in Hungarian. Since *is*- or *sem*-phrases convey a meaning involving addition, the sense of exclusion by identity associated with the focus position prevents them from being placed there. In other words, if identical syntactic constituents are conjoined by the negative correlative *sem*, we have no means to determine whether they belong to a single constituent or are parts of an elliptic coordinate sentence.

(329) a.   Sem Richárd, sem Anna, sem Péter nem olvasta   a
           nor Richard nor Anna nor Peter not read.DEF the

           könyvet.
           book.ACC
           'Neither Richard, nor Anna, nor Peter has read the book.'

b. Sem Richárd (nem olvasta a könyvet), sem Anna (nem olvasta a könyvet), sem Péter nem olvasta a könyvet.
'Neither Richard, nor Anna, nor Peter has read the book.'

Indirect evidence can be found in coordinate sentences containing non-identical, thus inomissible, constituents. Since *sem* acts as a correlative in an identical manner, we have reason to suppose that it is a clausal correlative conjunction whenever it is preposed.

(330)   Sem Anna nem olvasott a   kertben,   sem Péter nem
         nor Anna not   read   the garden.INE nor Peter not

tanult   a   szobában.
studied the room.INE
'Neither Anna was reading in the garden, nor Peter was studying in the room.'

Given the historical evidence that *sem* is derived from *is* 'also' + *nem* 'not', and that *is* is related to *és* 'and', the status of *sem* as a conjunction seems to be corroborated.

1.4.5. Negative raising

A small class of verbs expressing mental states show the effects of what has come to be called negative raising. It is in fact a paraphrase relation between a pair of sentences, of which one has negation in the subordinate clause, and the other in the main clause.

(331) a. Azt   hiszem,   hogy Anna nem olvas.
          it.ACC think.DEF.1SG that Anna not reads
          'I think Anna isn't reading.'

b. Nem hiszem,   hogy Anna olvas.
    not think.DEF.1SG that Anna reads
    'I don't think Anna's reading.'

If the subordinate clause contains an UNPI, such as *senki* 'no one', which can occur only in the context of clausemate negation, and the negation word is in the main clause, the UNPI has to change into an existential negative polarity item (ENPI), formed from the existential quantifier *valaki* 'someone' and the clitic *is*. (Note that the term "existential" refers to this circumstance rather than the meaning of the ENPI in this construction-type.)

(332) a.   Azt   hiszem,   hogy Anna nem olvasott semmi-t
           it.ACC think.DEF.1SG that   Anna not   read   nothing-ACC

           (sem).
           nor
           'I think Anna hasn't read anything.'

     b.   Nem hiszem,   hogy Anna olvasott valami-t   is.
           not   think.DEF.1SG that   Anna read   anything-ACC CL
           'I don't think Anna has read anything.'

In contrast with UNPIs in Hungarian, and NPIs such as *anything* in Eng-
lish, ENPIs in Hungarian cannot coocur with clausemate negation,
although, similarly to NPIs in English, they are licit in questions.

(333) a.   *Azt hiszem, Anna nem olvasott valamit is.

     b.   Kétlem,   hogy Anna olvasott-e valamit   is.
           doubt.DEF.1SG that   Anna read-Q   anything CL
           'I doubt if Anna has read anything.'

   Although the negation word does not raise out of the subordinate
clause, UNPIs can in fact move into a higher sentence. In this case, the two
sentences cease to be paraphrases of each other, since the scope of the
moved quantifier is wider than that of the one in the lower clause.

(334) a.   Azt   hisz-em,   hogy Anna semmi-t   sem olvasott.
           it.ACC think-DEF.1SG that   Anna nothing-ACC not   read
           'I think that Anna has read nothing.'

     b.   Semmi-t   sem hisz-ek,   hogy Anna olvasott.
           nothing-ACC not think-1SG that   Anna read
           'For no *x* do I think that Anna has read *x*.'

"Negative raising" works only if the negation in the lower clause has
wide scope there. If negation is in scope there, no paraphrase is possible
along the lines presented. The following pair illustrates this, since the
translations show the lack of equivalence.

(335) a.   Azt   hiszem,   hogy Anna sem olvas.
           it.ACC think.DEF.1SG that   Anna nor reads
           'I think that Anna, too, is not reading.'

     b.   Nem hiszem,   hogy Anna is   olvas.
           not   think.DEF.1SG that   Anna also reads
           'I don't think that Anna, too, is reading.'

1.5. ANAPHORA

1.5.1. Means for expressing anaphora

1.5.1.1–2. Deletion

Subject and (singular) object anaphoric pronouns can be dropped. Since (nominative) possessor pronouns in possessive constructions can also be omitted, conditions of deletion may depend on case rather than on function. Zero signs stand for deleted pronouns, though the positions they are in do not necessarily correspond to their actual sites, as will be seen below.

(336) a.   Anna$_i$ megvette   a   könyvet$_j$, de Ø$_i$ nem olvassa   Ø$_j$
         Anna bought.DEF the book.ACC but   not reads.DEF
         'Anna has bought the book but she isn't reading it.'

    b.   A fiúk$_i$ megvették   a   könyveket$_j$, de Ø$_i$ nem olvassák
         the boys bought.DEF the books.ACC but   not read.DEF

         őket/*Ø$_j$
         them
         'The boys have bought the books, but they are not reading them.'

    c.   Anna$_i$ olvassa   a   Ø$_i$ könyv-é-t.
         Anna reads.DEF. the   book-POSS-ACC
         'Anna is reading her book.'

Since Hungarian has both subject and (definite) object agreement marked on the verb, and agreement with the possessor is marked on the possessed noun, the deleted pronouns are recoverable.

1.5.1.3. Personal pronouns

As was mentioned above, if the object is plural, the personal pronoun has to be used in back-reference. It is also used for both [+human] subject and object if they are placed in any of the preverbal positions, such as topic, focus, or in the *is*-phrase. (First clauses are not given here.)

(337) a.   ... de ő   nem olvas.
             but she not reads
         ' ... but she's not reading.'

    b.   ... de nem ő   olvas.
             but not she reads
         ' ... but it isn't her that's reading.'

    c.   ... de ő   sem olvas.
         but she nor reads
        '... but she, too, is not reading.'

In the preverbal positions personal pronominal objects can be used in reference to persons only. Thus, postverbal positions are seen as "weak", allowing appropriate pronouns to be dropped (if in subject or object position), or assume the form of a personal pronoun (in all other cases), while preverbal positions appear to be "strong", ruling out pronoun deletion or personal pronouns acting as general anaphoric devices.

(338) a.   Anna olvasta   a   könyv-et, de nem beszélt ról-a.
         Anna read.DEF the book-ACC but not spoke DEL-3SG
         'Anna had read the book, but she didn't speak about it.'

     b.   Anna olvasta   a   könyv-ek-et, de nem beszélt ról-uk.
         Anna read.DEF the book-PL-ACC but not spoke DEL-3PL
         'Anna had read the books, but she didn't speak about them.'

(339) a.   ... de őket nem látta   Anna.
         but them not saw.DEF Anna
         '... but Anna didn't see them [+human].'

     b.   ... de Anna nem látta őket.
         '... but Anna didn't see them [±human].'

A similar regularity is discussed in relation to personal and demonstrative pronouns directly.

1.5.1.4. Reflexive pronouns

Coreference between constituents of the same clause is realized by means of reflexive pronouns, which can be case-marked as ordinary NPs. There is a slight uncertainty as to the actual form of the reflexive paradigm since there are at least four competing versions available: *mag-a* 'self–POSS.3SG', *ön-mag-a* 'one-self-POSS.3SG', *saját-maga* 'own-self-POSS.3SG', and *ő-mag-a* 's/he-self-POSS.3SG' (especially in oblique cases), every one of which can be declined in the possessive paradigm in number and person, and that is how person-marking is made possible in reflexive pronouns. Although the glosses given here are by and large adequate, the stem of the reflexive pronoun is not regarded by speakers of Hungarian as having independent meaning, such as 'self' assigned to it below.

(340) a.   Anna látja   mag-á-t.
         Anna sees.DEF self-POSS.3SG-ACC
         'Anna sees herself.'

b.   A   fiúk   látják   mag-uk-at.
the boys see.DEF self-POSS.3PL-ACC
'The boys see themselves.'

In the possessive construction, the identity of the possessor with one or another constituent of the same clause is usually indicated, not by a reflexive pronoun (although it is not prohibited), but by the attribute *saját* 'own'.

(341) a.   Anna a   saját könyv-é-t   olvassa
Anna the own book-POSS-ACC reads.DEF
'Anna is reading her own book.'

   b.   Anna ?*önmaga/a maga/sajátmaga könyv-é-t olvassa.
'Anna is reading her own book.'

This may be due to the fact that the reflexive paradigm is also used for emphatic pronouns, even in (pro-dropped) subject positions – with the possible exception of *önmaga*, etc.

(342) a.   (Péter) (saját)maga olvassa a könyvet.
'Peter/He is reading the book himself.'

   b.   ?*Péter önmaga olvassa a könyvet.

1.5.1.5. *Demonstrative anaphoric pronouns*

The nonproximate demonstrative pronoun provides the "missing link" in preverbal position for reference to nonhuman objects in all syntactic functions.

(343) a.   *Anna olvasta   a   könyv-et, de nem *ról-a*   beszélt
Anna   read.DEF the book.ACC but not   DEL-3SG spoke

   b.   Anna olvasta a könyv-et, de nem *ar-ról*   beszélt.
                                          that-DEL
'Anna had read the book, but she didn't speak about it.'

The demonstrative is also used postverbally in reference to [–human] subjects and singular objects, since their "weak" version is not the corresponding personal pronoun, but the deleted form, as was seen above. Note that since the postverbal site is, as a rule, a "weak" position, overt pronouns are in general seen as awkward.

(344) a.   A   könyv le-esett,   de Anna fel-emelt-e
the book   down-fell but Anna up-picked-DEF.3SG

Ø/?az-t/*ő-t.
Ø/that/he-ACC
'The book fell down but Anna picked it up.'

b. Anna megvette a   könyvet, de nem olvast-a
Anna bought   the book.ACC but not   read-DEF.3SG

Ø/?az-t/*ő-t.
that/he-ACC
'Anna bought the book but she didn't read it.'

Another use of the demonstrative *az* 'that' constitutes a case of "switch reference", in which the subject of the first clause becomes the object of the second one, and vice versa, provided both are [+human]. Here the preferred distribution of pronominals preserves the personal pronoun for the former subject and renders the former object as a demonstrative in the second clause (Pléh and Radics 1978).

(345) a. Richárd$_i$ látta   Pétert$_j$,   de Ø$_i$ nem köszönt nek–i$_j$
Richard saw.DEF Peter.ACC but   not   greeted DAT-3SG
'Richard$_i$ saw Peter$_j$, but he$_i$ didn't greet him$_j$.'

b. Richárd$_i$ látta Pétert$_j$, de az$_j$ nem köszönt nek-i$_i$
'Richard$_i$ saw Peter$_j$, but he$_j$ didn't greet him$_i$.'

This alternation may be due to the more "highlighted" position of the subject in the second conjunct; in fact, the "switch" may just as well be executed by means of the overt personal pronoun *ő* here, which indicates that the default case of pronoun omission is compatible with identical subjects, while overt pronouns, whether personal or demonstrative, signal a change of subjects across clauses.

1.5.1.6. Other means

In place of pronominal cross-reference, various expressions can be used, such as (a) NPs complete with demonstratives and (b) anaphoric epithets.

(346) a. Shaw érdekesebb   Wilde-nál, de ezt a   szerzőt
Shaw more.interesting Wilde-ADE but this the author.ACC

a   kortársaik   jobban szerették mint azt.
the their.contemporaries better liked.DEF than that.ACC
'Shaw is more interesting than Wilde, but their contemporaries preferred this author [Wilde] to that one [Shaw].'

b. Péter olvasta a   könyvet, de a   hülye nem emlékszik
Peter read.DEF the book.ACC but the idiot not remembers

rá.
it.SUP
'Peter has read the book but the idiot doesn't remember it.'

1.5.2. Domains of anaphora

1.5.2.1. Within the clause

If there are coreferential constituents within the same clause, except for the one highest in the hierarchy of syntactic functions (or cases), they must take the form of reflexive pronouns. The hierarchy itself can be seen as having the subject (or nominative) at the top, and the "more" oblique NPs at the bottom (cf. É. Kiss 1987).

(347) a. Anna látja   önmagá-t.
          Anna sees.DEF self-ACC
          'Anna sees herself.'

      b. Anná-t   megmutattam   önmagá-nak.
          Anna-ACC showed.DEF.1SG self-DAT
          'I showed Anna to herself.'

      c. Anná-nak sokat írtam   önmagá-ról.
          Anna-DAT much wrote.1SG self-DEL
          'I have written a lot to Anna about herself.'

      d. *Anná-ról sokat írtam önmagá-nak.

If the coreferential NP is in a postpositional phrase, usually reflexives are rejected and personal pronouns are used.

(348)   Péter nem beszél Annáról   *önmaga mögött/mögött-e.
          Peter not speaks Anna.DEL self   behind/behind-3SG
          'Peter doesn't speak of Anna behind herself/her.'

If the coreferential NP is a possessor in a possessive NP, it is almost always omitted. If the pronoun is overt, the preferred reading is disjoint reference with respect to any other constituent in the same clause. In other words, omission of the pronoun is compatible with both clausemate or non-clausemate coreference.

(349) a. Anna$_i$ olvasta   a   Ø$_{i/j}$ könyv-é-t.
          Anna read.DEF the   book-POSS-ACC
          'Anna$_i$ has read her$_{i/j}$ book.'

      b. Anna$_i$ olvasta az ő$_j$ könyvét.
                          she
          'Anna$_i$ has read her$_j$ book.'

1.5.2.2. Between coordinate clauses

As was shown in the previous section, there are various means for expressing coreference in coordinate structures, depending on syntactic

functions and positions, and whether the NP has + or – human reference. Naturally, in coordinate structures it is always the first one of the two coreferential NPs that must be in full form. In short, coreferential NPs in the second conjunct observe the following regularities. (For more on coreference relations between different clauses, see Kenesei 1994.)

(350) a. If the NP coreferential with some NP in the first clause is [+human], then it is a personal pronoun, and if postverbal, it can be dropped in subject, and, if singular, also in object positions; if preverbal, the pronouns remain overt.

b. If the NP coreferential with some NP in the first clause is [-human], it has the form of the demonstrative *az* 'that', but if it is postverbal and not a subject or singular object, it can be the corresponding personal pronoun.

c. If there are two pairs of coreferential [+human] NPs, there is a marked preference for a (possibly omitted) personal pronoun in the subject of the second clause to refer back to the subject of the first one, and for a demonstrative to refer back to the nonsubject of the first clause.

Other expressions, such as NPs with demonstratives or anaphoric epithets, are also applicable.

1.5.2.3. Between superordinate and subordinate clauses

In contrast with coordinate structures, the order of the antecedent and anaphoric NP is not fixed in these structures. However, two subcases have to be distinguished.

The first subclass of clauses, which is called here independent subordination, is not embedded into or lexically governed by any constituent in the main clause. If such a clause precedes the main clause, either the antecedent or the anaphoric NP can occur in it, with the other one in the main clause.

(351) a. Bár · Anna$_i$ nem tanul, Ø$_i$ olvassa   a   könyvet.
         though Anna not studies   reads.DEF the book.ACC
         'Although Anna is not studying, she's reading the book.'

b. Bár Ø$_i$ nem tanul, Anna$_i$ olvassa a könyvet.
    'Although she's not studying, Anna is reading the book.'

In the reversed order of the clauses the anaphoric NP cannot occur in the main clause.

(352) a. Anna$_i$ olvassa a könyvet, bár Ø$_i$ nem tanul.
         'Anna is reading the book, though she's not studying.'

b.   *$\emptyset_i$ olvassa a könyvet, bár Anna$_i$ nem tanul.
'She is reading the book, though Anna is not studying.'

Note that epithets behave the same way as pronominals – at least for the dialect of Hungarian discussed here. In another dialect anaphoric NPs in a first clause are unacceptable throughout, and epithets are permissible only in a second main clause.

The second subclass, dependent subordination, also allows the subordinate clause to be placed before or after the rest of the main clause. It differs from the previous subclass in two respects: (i) antecedents are forbidden in the subordinate clause since they would be c-commanded by a coreferential pronoun, and (ii) epithets are disallowed even in first subordinate clauses, although, as expected, pronominal coreference goes through. (A constituent A c-commands a constituent B iff every category dominating A also dominates B. For example, a subject c-commands the object or any constituent in a complement clause, but no object or no constituent in a complement clause can c-command the (main clause) subject.)

(353) a.   Hogy $\emptyset$/*a hülye$_i$ elvesztette   a   kulcsot, *Péter$_i$ nem
that   the idiot   lost.DEF.3SG the key.ACC Peter not

tudta.
knew.DEF
'That he/the idiot had lost the key, Peter didn't know.'

b.   *Hogy Péter$_i$ elvesztette a kulcsot, $\emptyset_i$ nem tudta.
'That Peter had lost the key, he didn't know.'

c.   Péter$_i$ nem tudta, hogy $\emptyset_i$ elvesztette a kulcsot.
'Peter didn't know that he'd lost the key.'

d.   *$\emptyset_i$ nem tudta, hogy Péter$_i$ elvesztette a kulcsot.
'He didn't know that Peter had lost the key.'

That is, preposed dependent clauses behave as if they were in their "original" positions, and both pronouns and epithets observe the relevant principle of binding, viz., that referring expressions (antecedents and epithets) cannot be c-commanded by coreferential items.

Nonfinite clauses differ from finite ones only in that their subjects are necessarily suppressed. Any other anaphoric NP is pronominalized along the lines discussed so far.

(354) a.   Anna nem szereti   [a [ról-a   beszélő]   lányok–at]
Anna not   likes.DEF the DEL-3SG talk-APRT girls-ACC
'Anna doesn't like the girls talking about her.'

b.   Az asztal-t   [az-on/rajt-a   áll-va]
the table-ACC that-SUP/SUP-3SG stand-SCVB

festettem.
painted.DEF.1SG
'I painted the table standing on it.'

1.5.2.4. *Between different subordinate clauses*

What has been said about coreference between main and subordinate clauses obviously carries over to the relationship of two subordinate clauses if one clause is embedded in another, which is in turn embedded in a third one.

   If some main clause has more than one subordinate clause embedded in it, all combinations are acceptable as long as the antecedent is not c-commanded by the coreferential pronoun.

(355) a.   Bár $\emptyset_i$ keveset olvasott, nem tudtam,   hogy Anna$_i$
           though   little   read.3SG not   knew.DEF.1SG that   Anna

           megbukott.
           flunked
           'Although she had read little, I didn't know that Anna had flunked.'

      b.   Bár Anna$_i$ keveset olvasott, nem tudtam, hogy $\emptyset_i$ megbukott.
           'Although Anna had read little, I didn't know that she'd flunked.'

(356) a.   Azt,   hogy $\emptyset_i$ megbukott, azért nem értem,
           it.ACC that   flunked   for.it not   understand.DEF.1SG

           mert   Anna$_i$ sokat olvasott.
           because Anna much read
           'I don't understand that she'd flunked because Anna had read a lot.'

      b.   Azt, hogy Anna$_i$ megbukott, azért nem értem, mert $\emptyset_i$ sokat olvasott.
           'I don't understand that Anna had flunked because she'd read a lot.'

Again, epithets can replace the (empty) pronouns in each example above.

1.5.2.5. Between different sentences

Pronouns, demonstratives, and epithets are used in different sentences according to the regularities observed in coordinate structures, as seen in the following discourses.

(357) a. Richárd_i látta Péter-t_j
Richard saw Peter-ACC
'Richard saw Peter.'

b. Ø_i köszönt nek-i_j
greeted DAT-3SG
'He_i greeted him_j.'

c. Az_j köszönt nek-i_i
'He_j greeted him_i.'

1.6. REFLEXIVES

1.6.1. Means of expressing reflexivity

1.6.1.1. Reflexive pronouns

As was discussed in 1.5.1.4, there are a number of variable nonclitic reflexive pronouns, all based on *mag-a* 'self-POSS.3SG', derived from *mag* 'body' according to the most probable hypothesis. The others are *ön-mag-a* 'one-self-POSS.3SG', *ő-mag-a* 's/he-self-POSS.3SG', *saját-mag-a* 'own-self–POSS.3SG', and the emphatic reflexives *ennen-mag-a* 'one-self-POSS.3SG' and *maga-mag-a* 'self-self-POSS.3SG'. Three of them, i.e., *maga, önmaga,* and *sajátmaga,* are widely used with the first and shortest form as the most frequent one. The fourth, *ennenmaga* is archaic or perhaps even obsolete, but this one just like the other three can be declined in all persons (see 2.1.2.2), unlike the last pronoun, *magamaga,* whose use is restricted to third person singular.

Although *maga* is the oldest and most widespread form, since it is homophonous with the distant form of address *maga* 'you, Sie, vous' and also with the emphatic pronoun, the form *önmaga* serves as the best item to test the distribution of the reflexive.

The reflexive pronoun in object position requires definite object agreement on the verb.

(358)   A fiúk látják   mag-uk-at
ön-mag-uk-at
ők-et mag-uk-at
saját-mag-uk-at
ennen-mag-uk-at
the boys see.DEF one/own-self-POSS.3PL-ACC
'The boys see themselves.'

1.6.1.2. *Verbal affix*

There is a set of derivative affixes that form reflexive verbs from agentive ones. Although the class is generally characterized as productive, best examples come from activities relating to bodily functions. Analytic reflexive constructions formed by means of the reflexive pronoun are unacceptable or rather clumsy.

(359) a. Anna fésül-i   Péter-t/?mag-á-t.
          Anna comb$_V$-DEF.3SG Peter/self-3SG-ACC
          'Anna is combing Peter/herself.'

      b. Anna fésül-köd-ik.
          Anna comb$_V$-REFL-3SG
          'Anna is combing herself.'

(360) a. Ti   mos-sá-tok   Anná-t/?maga-tok-at.
          you.PL wash-DEF-2PL Anna/self-2PL-ACC
          'You are washing Anna/yourselves.'

      b. Ti   mos-akod-tok.
          you wash-REFL-2PL
          'You are washing yourselves.'

1.6.2. The scope of reflexivity

Reflexive pronouns are strictly clausemate. Apparent violations are due to a suppressed identical subject in nonfinite constructions.

(361) a. Anna$_i$ olvasta,   hogy Péter$_j$ látta   magá-t$_{j/*i}$
          Anna read.DEF that   Peter saw.DEF self-ACC

      b. Anna$_i$ szeret olvas-ni magá-ról$_i$.
          Anna likes   read-INF self-DEL
          'Anna likes to read about herself.'

The attributive modifier *saját* 'own' is used in possessive constructions, but since it is not related to either reflexive construction on the one hand, and it can work across clause boundaries (although it always searches for the closest antecedent), we will forgo illustrating it below.

(362)   Anna$_i$ látta,   hogy a   saját$_i$ könyv-e   is   elveszett.
         Anna saw.DEF that   the own   book-POSS also got-lost
         'Anna saw that her own books also got lost.'

1.6.3. Antecedents and functions of the reflexive affix

The reflexivizer affix is restricted to subject antecedents and it operates on direct objects only, as illustrated in the examples above.

1.6.4. Syntactic positions of the reflexive pronoun

Independent of the syntactic functions of constituents in general and reflexive pronouns in particular, various preverbal and postverbal positions are available for the items under discussion. Thus, they can be (a) topic, (b) in an *is*-quantified phrase, (c) focus, or (d) among the postverbal constituents.

(363) a.   Magá-t   Anna nagyon szereti.
           self-ACC Anna much   likes.DEF
           'Anna likes herself very much.'

      b.   Magá-ról is   Péter olvasott a   legtöbbet.
           self-DEL also Peter read   the most
           'Peter has read the most about himself, too.'

      c.   Anna csak **magá-t**   szereti.
           Anna only self-ACC likes.DEF
           'Anna likes only herself.'

      d.   Péter olvasott magá-ról a legtöbbet.
           'Peter has read the most about himself.'

1.6.5. Antecedent–reflexive relations

In the section titles below the first term stands for the antecedent, the second for the reflexive. Functions omitted either do not exist in Hungarian or no reflexive pronoun is possible in those functions.

1.6.5.1. Subject – direct object

(364)   Anna látja magá-t.
           'Anna sees herself.'

1.6.5.2. Subject – modifier of direct object

Although the attribute *saját* 'own' is used most frequently to identify the possessor with another constituent in the sentence, it is not impossible to use a reflexive pronoun either as a nominative or dative possessor, especially if the topic–focus structure is appropriate.

(365) a.   Önmaga/Önmagá-nak a   kép-e-i-t   csak **Péter**
           self-NOM/self-DAT   the picture-POSS-PL-ACC only Peter

           nézegette.
           stared.DEF
           'Only Peter was staring at his own pictures.'

   b.   ?*Csak **Péter** nézegette önmaga képeit.

Another context in which reflexives are in principle possible is in object, or in general, NP complement functions, studied in some detail by É. Kiss (1987). As was discussed in 1.2.5.2.7, case-marked complement NPs to head nouns are acceptable only if the head noun is in the nominative or accusative; if it is in any other (i.e., oblique) case, the structure is ruled out. Since such NPs form separate domains for coreference relations, reflexive pronouns are grammatical only if they have an antecedent inside the NP, which rules out the subject as immediate antecedent, unless there is an understood "suppressed subject" within the noun phrase, whose antecedent is the subject of the clause.

(366) a.   Péter megtalálta [a cikk-et   ról-a/önmagá–ról]
              Peter found.DEF the article-ACC DEL-3SG/self-DEL
              'Peter has found the article about him/himself.'

       b.   Péter megtalálta [a cikk-é-t   önmagá-ról/*róla]
                              article-POSS-ACC
              'Peter has found his article about him/himself.'

       c.   *Péter tanult [a cikk-é-ből   ról-a/önmagá-ról]
              Peter learned the article-POSS-ELA DEL-3SG/self-DEL
              'Peter has learned from the article about him/himself.'

1.6.5.3/5. Subject – indirect object

Dative- or adposition-marked indirect objects can be reflexive pronouns.

(367) a.   Anna magá-nak küldte   a   könyvet.
              Anna self-DAT   sent.DEF the book.ACC
              'Anna sent the book to herself.'

       b.   Anna önmaga részére küldte a könyvet.
                   self   for
              'Anna sent the book to herself.'

1.6.5.4/6. Subject – modifier of indirect object

The above remark concerning ordering conditions applies here, too.

(368) a.   A   maga ellenség-é-nek   senki nem küld könyvet.
              the self enemy-POSS-DAT no one not   sends book
              'No one sends books to his/her own enemy.'

       b.   Önmaga ellenség-e   számára senki nem küld könyvet.
              self   enemy-POSS for
              'No one sends books to his/her own enemy.'

1.6.5.7–8. Subject – (modifier of) copular complement

Both the nominal predicate and its possessive modifier can be a reflexive pronoun. Note that, like all copular complement nouns, the reflexive is not used in a referential sense.

(369) a. Péter nem önmaga volt.
Peter not self   was
'Peter wasn't himself (= his usual self).'

b. Péter önmaga ellenség-e   volt.
Peter self   enemy-POSS was
'Peter was his own enemy.'

1.6.5.9–10. Subject – (modifier of) subject-complement

(370) a. Anna önmaga maradt.
Anna self   remained
'Anna remained herself.'

b. Mi önmag-unk ellenség-e-i   maradtunk.
we self-1PL   enemy-POSS-PL remained
'We remained our own enemies.'

1.6.5.11–12. Subject – (modifier of) object-complement

No reflexive can occur in object-complements or their modifiers.

(371) a. *A szobrász Péter-t$_i$ önmagá-ra$_i$ formázta.
the sculptor Peter-ACC self-SUB   formed.DEF
'The sculptor formed Peter into himself.'

b. *A szobrász Péter-t$_i$ önmaga$_i$ alak-já-ra
the sculptor Peter-ACC self   shape-POSS-SUB

formázta.
formed.DEF
'The sculptor formed Peter into his own shape.'

1.6.5.13–14. Subject – (modifier of) object of adjective

(372) a. Anna elégedett volt önmagá-val.
Anna content   was self-INS
'Anna was content with herself.'

b. Önmaga barát-a-i-val   senki   nem elégedett.
self   friend-POSS-PL-INS no-one not   content
'No one is content with his/her own friends.'

1.6.5.17. Subject – case-marked and adpositional phrase

The subject can serve as antecedent for a reflexive in all of the case-marked complement or adverbial phrases, provided there are no independent restrictions against (for example) referential NPs in them, and both subtypes of postpositional NPs contain case-like or real postpositions.

(373) a.   Anna magá-ra gondolt.
           Anna self-SUB thought
           'Anna thought of herself.'

      b.   Péter magá-ra öntötte   a   vizet.
           Peter self-SUB spilled.DEF the water.ACC
           'Peter spilled the water on himself.'

      c.   *Anna maga-ként érkezett.
           Anna self-FOR   came
           'Anna came in the function of herself.'

(374) a.   Anna maga után húzta   a   kocsit.
           Anna self   after pulled.DEF the cart.ACC
           'Anna pulled the cart after her(self).'

      b.   Anna magá-val együtt   Péter-t   is be-számította.
           Anna self-INS together Peter-ACC CL PFX-counted.DEF
           'Anna counted in Peter, too, together with herself.'

1.6.5.18. Subject – modifier of case-marked and adpositional phrase

Reflexive pronouns as possessive modifiers are possible in case-marked NPs, but not in postpositional phrases.

(375) a.   A   maga ellenség-é-ről   senki   nem beszél.
           the self   enemy-POSS-DEL no one not   speaks
           'No one speaks of his/her enemy.'

      b.   *Önmaga barát-a-i-val   együtt Anna Pétert   is
           self   friend-POSS-PL-INS together Anna Peter.ACC also

           beszámította.
           counted-in
           'Anna counted in Peter together with self's friends.'

1.6.5.19–25. Modifier of subject – other constituents

No modifier or complement in the subject can, in general, be the antecedent of a reflexive pronoun in the clause.

(376) a. *Anna kés-e   meg-sebezte   önmagá-t.
          Anna knife-POSS PFX-wounded.DEF self-ACC
          'Anna's knife hurt herself.'

     b. *A cikk   Péter-ről   meglepte   önmagá-t.
          the article Peter-DEL surprised.DEF self-ACC
          'The article about Peter surprised himself.'

1.6.5.26. *Modifier of subject – copular complement*

There is, however, one structure in which a subject modifier can serve as
the antecedent of a reflexive in the clause: copular sentences in which the
subject is a possessive NP, whether nominative or dative, or inside or
outside the NP proper.

(377) a. [Péter legnagyobb ellenség-e]   **önmaga** volt.
          Peter greatest   enemy-POSS himself was
          'Peter's greatest enemy was himself.'

     b. Péternek **önmaga** volt a legnagyobb ellensége.
          'Peter's greatest enemy was himself.'

1.6.5.37. *Direct object – subject*

Again, certain focussed structures allow reflexive pronouns to occur in the
subject position, but here and further below the antecedent has to precede
the reflexive.

(378) a. *Sajátmaga meg-sebezte   Péter-t.
          self   PFX-wounded.DEF Peter-ACC
          'Himself wounded Peter.'

     b. Péter-t **sajátmaga** sebezte meg.
          ca. 'Peter was wounded by (none other but) **himself**.'

1.6.5.38. *Direct object – modifier of subject*

The modifier of the subject cannot be a reflexive pronoun if the object is
the antecedent, but its complement can – if there is an appropriate ante-
cedent inside the NP, which again prevents the object from being the
antecedent proper of the reflexive.

(379) a. *Péter-t **önmaga barát-ja**   sebezte meg.
                 self   friend-POSS
          'Peter was wounded by self's friend.'

b.   *Péter-t   meg-lepte   [a   könyv önmagá-ról]
     Peter-ACC PFX-surprised.DEF the book   self-DEL
     'Peter was surprised by the book about himself.'

c.   Péter-t meglepte [a könyv-e   önmagá-ról]
                            book-POSS
     'Peter was surprised by his book about himself.'

1.6.5.39. Direct object – indirect object

Dative-marked indirect objects can be reflexive pronouns with direct objects as antecedents.

(380)   Anná-t   megmutattam   önmagá-nak.
          Anna-ACC showed.DEF.1SG self-DAT
          'I showed Anna to herself.'

1.6.5.49. Direct object – object of adjective

This is a possible configuration.

(381)   Péter-t   [önmagá-ra büszké-nek] tartottam.
          Peter-ACC self-SUB   proud-DAT considered.DEF.1SG
          'I considered Peter proud of himself.'

1.6.5.55–72. Modifier of direct object – other constituents

No antecedent-reflexive relations are possible in such configurations.

(382)   *Péter$_i$ barát-já-t   megmutattam   önmagá-nak$_i$
          Peter   friend-POSS-ACC showed.DEF.1SG self-ACC
          'I showed Peter's$_i$ friend to himself$_i$.'

1.6.5.73–74. Indirect object – (modifier of) subject

This is again possible under proper focussing conditions.

(383) a.   *Önmaga küldte   Péter-nek a   könyvek-et.
           self   sent.DEF Peter-DAT the books-ACC
           'Himself sent the books to Peter.'

b.   ?Péter-nek **önmaga** küldte a könyveket.
     ca. 'The books were sent to Peter by (none other but) HIMSELF.'

It is in this connection that we mention verbs of "passive" mental processes like *tetszik* 'please', *látszik* 'appear', *ötletet ad* 'give an idea (to)' and the like, which take experiencer NPs in the dative and themes in

nominative subjects, thus making it possible for the dative NP to serve as antecedent to the subject reflexive pronoun, though only if the verb or the reflexive is stressed.

(384) a.   Péter-nek   **tetszik** önmaga.
           Peter-DAT pleases self.NOM
           'Peter likes himself.'

     b.   Péter-nek   **önmaga** látszik   a   legnagyobb-nak.
           Peter-DAT self   appears the greatest-DAT
           'It's himself that appears to Peter to be the greatest.'

Neither a "true" indirect object, i.e., a beneficiary, nor experiencer NPs can be the antecedent of a reflexive inside a subject NP.

(385) a.   *Péter-nek$_i$ a   postás   önmaga$_i$ mögött küldte   a
           Peter-DAT the postman self   behind sent.DEF the
           könyveket.
           books.ACC
           'The postman behind himself sent Peter the books.'

     b.   *Péter-nek a   kép   önmagá-ról adta   az ötlet-et.
           Peter-DAT the picture self-DEL   gave.DEF the idea-ACC
           'The picture of himself gave Peter the idea.'

1.6.5.75–76. Indirect object – (modifier of) direct object

This configuration is somewhat less acceptable than the reverse order (see 1.6.5.39), though it is still well within the boundaries of grammaticality: reflexives in modifers are ruled out.

(386) a.   Anná-nak   megmutattam   önmagá-t.
           Anna-DAT showed.DEF.1SG self-ACC
           'I showed herself to Anna.'

     b.   *Anná-nak megmutattam a   kép-et   önmagá-ról.
           Anna-DAT showed.1SG   the picture-ACC self-DEL
           'I showed Anna the picture of herself.'

1.6.5.77–78. Indirect object – (modifier of) case-marked or adpositional NP

The indirect object is a possible antecedent of such NPs, but not of their modifiers.

(387) a.   Beszéltem Anná-nak   önmagá-ról.
           spoke.1SG Anna-DAT self-DEL
           'I spoke to Anna about herself.'

b.   Érveltem   Anná-nak   önmaga ellen.
argued.1SG Anna-DAT self   against
'I argued to Anna against herself.'

(388) a.   *Beszéltem Anná-nak önmaga barátai-ról.
'I spoke to Anna about self's friends.'

b.   *Érveltem   Anná-nak   önmaga barátai   ellen.
argued.1SG Anna-DAT self   friends.POSS against
'I argued to Anna against self's friends.'

1.6.5.89–104. Modifier of indirect object – other constituents

No coreference relations between the modifier of an indirect object and any other constituent of the clause are possible.

(389)   *Anna$_i$ barát-já-nak   megmutattam   önmagát$_i$
Anna   friend-POSS-DAT showed.DEF.1SG self
'I showed to Anna's$_i$ friend herself$_i$.'

1.6.5.173. Case-marked or adpositional phrase – subject

As before, only focussed reflexives are possible, if at all.

(390) a.   ?Péter-ről **önmaga** beszél a   legtöbbet.
Peter-DEL self   speaks the most
'Peter speaks the most about himself.'

b.   ?Péter után csak **önmaga** vágyakozik.
Peter after only self   yearns
'Only Peter yearns for himself.'

1.6.5.175. Case-marked or adpositional phrase – object

Same as 1.6.5.173.

(391) a.   ?Péter-ről **önmagá-t** kell   meghallgatnunk.
Peter-DEL self-ACC must hear.1PL
'We have to hear about Peter **himself**.'

b.   ?Péter ellen   **önmagá-t** küldjük.
Peter against self-ACC send.DEF.1PL
'We'll send against Peter **himself**.'

1.6.5.177. Case-marked or adpositional phrase – indirect object

Same as 1.6.5.173.

(392) a.   ?Péter-től   csak **önmagá-nak** érkeznek levelek.
             Peter-ABL only self-DAT   come   letters
             'Letters are coming in from Peter only to himself.'

       b.   ?Péter felől csak **önmagá-nak** érkeznek levelek.
                  from
             'Letters are coming in from Peter only to himself.'

1.6.5.191. Case-marked or adpositional phrase – case-marked or adpositional phrase

Coreference relations in two similar phrases are again possible with some restrictions owing to closer or more distant lexical government relations. It appears that at least the antecedent has to be lexically governed. Moreover, if one of the phrases is in no lexical relation, focussing may sometimes circumvent difficulties.

(393) a.   Beszéltem Anná-val önmagá-ról.
             spoke.1SG Anna-INS self-DEL
             'I spoke with Anna about herself.'

       b.   *Beszéltem Anná-ról önmagá-val.
             'I spoke about Anna with herself.'

       c.   ?Anná-ról **önmagá-val** beszéltem.
             'It was with her(self) that I spoke about Anna.'

(394) a.   ?Anná-val **önmaga miatt**   beszéltem.
             Anna-INS self   because spoke.1SG
             'I spoke with Anna because of herself.'

       b.   *Anna miatt **önmagá-val** beszéltem.
             'I spoke because of Anna with herself.'

Adpositional phrases are acceptable as antecedents only if there is a clear lexical government relation.

(395) a.   ?Anna$_i$ iránt **önmaga$_i$ miatt**   érez Péter szeretet-et.
             Anna for self   because feel Peter affection-ACC
             'Peter feels an affection for Anna because of herself.'

       b.   *Anna$_i$ miatt **önmaga$_i$ iránt** érez Péter szeretetet.
             'Peter feels an affection because of Anna for herself.'

1.6.5.193–212. Modifier of case-marked or adpositional phrase – other constituents

No coreference relations are possible.

(396) a. *Anna_i barát-já-ról   **önmagá-t**_i kérdeztem.
Anna   friend-POSS-DEL self-ACC   asked.1SG
'I asked about Anna's friend herself.'

b. *Anna_i barát-já-val **önmagá-ról**_i beszéltem.
'I spoke with Anna's friend about herself.'

1.6.6. Reflexives in nominalized clauses

Action nominalizations can contain reflexive pronouns, but note the following. In nominalizations of intransitive verbs the subject occupies the possessor's position and all other arguments retain their cases with or without the attributivizer participle *való* 'being'. Since the (antecedent) object, too, has to occupy the possessor's slot in a nominalization, the (reflexive) agent can only be placed in a postpositional phrase.

(397) a. Péter töröd-és-e   önmagá-val
Peter care-NML-POSS self-INS
'Peter's caring for himself'

b. Péter önmagá-val való   töröd-és-e
Peter self-INS   being care-NML-POSS
'Peter's caring for himself'

c. Péter önmaga által való   elítél-és-e
Peter self   by   being judge-NML-POSS
'Peter's judgment by himself'

Since possessor NPs are in a c-commanding position, they cannot be reflexive pronouns.

(398)   *Önmaga Péter által való elítélése.
'self's judgment by Peter'

1.6.7. Reflexives in ordinary NPs

Reflexive relations are possible also in NPs formed of result nominals or lexical nouns.

(399) a. Péter ítélet-e   önmaga ellen
Peter sentence-POSS self   against
'Peter's sentence against himself'

b. [Anna kép-e   önmagá-ról] jól   sikerült.
Anna picture-POSS self-DEL   well succeeded
'Anna's picture of herself was a success.'

1.6.8. Reflexive pronouns without overt antecedents

Although É. Kiss (1987) quotes examples of reflexives in so-called picture nominals that have no antecedents, others refuse these constructions without hesitation, and accept only the ones in which the reflexive has a (covert or overt) possessive antecedent.

(400) a.   %János-nak tetszett [a   történet önmagá-ról]
             John-DAT   pleased the story   self-DEL
             'John liked the story about himself.'

       b.   János-nak tetszett [a történet-e   önmagá-ról]
                                    story-POSS
             'John liked his story about himself.'

(401) a.   %János össze-tépte [a   vers-et   önmagá-hoz]
             John   up-tore.DEF the poem-ACC self-ALL
             'John tore up the poem to himself.'

       b.   János összetépte [a vers-é-t   önmagá-hoz]
                                poem-POSS- ACC
             'John tore up his poem to himself.'

Reflexives without overt antecedents in NPs are acceptable only if the NP contains a nonfinite verb-form whose agent can be suppressed and thus can serve as an "invisible" antecedent. In the first example below the suppressed agent of the participle *szóló* 'speaking' is the story, which cannot serve as antecedent to the reflexive, while the suppressed agent of *írott* 'written' can be identified with *János* and can thus provide an acceptable interpretation for the reflexive pronoun.

(402) a.   Jánosnak tetszett [az önmagá-ról ír-ott/*szól-ó
             John.DAT pleased the self-DEL   write-PPRT/speak-APRT

             történet]
             story
             'John liked the story written/*speaking about himself.'

       b.   János összetépte [az önmagá-hoz ír-ott vers-et]
             'John tore up the poem written to himself.'

1.6.9. Other uses of reflexives

Since there is no "impersonal" reflexive in Hungarian like English *oneself*, general reflexive (co)reference is achieved usually by the first person plural form, and less frequently by the second person plural.

(403) a.   [A versek önmag-unk-hoz] rendszerint gyengék.
           the poems self-1PL-ALL   regularly   feeble
           'Poems to oneself are usually feeble.'

      b.   [A versek önmag-*á/*uk/?atok-hoz] rendszerint gyengék.
                     self-3SG/3PL/2PL-ALL
           'Poems to himself/themselves/yourselves are usually feeble.'

1.7. RECIPROCITY

1.7.1. Means for expressing reciprocity

There is a single word *egymás*, compounded from words meaning 'one'
and 'other', serving as the reciprocal. Naturally, it needs a plural or
conjoined antecedent. The coreference relations of reciprocals have been
studied also by É. Kiss (1987).

(404) a.   Anna és Péter látják   egymás-t.
           Anna and Peter see.DEF each-other-ACC
           'Anna and Peter see each other.'

      b.   A fiú-k látják egymás-t.
           'The boys see each other.'

   Arguably, the same reflexivizer derivative affix that was discussed in
1.6.1.2 can be used to form reciprocal verbs from transitive ones, but there
are only a handful of verbs that can undergo the process (cf. Komlósy
1994).

(405) a.   Anna ver-i   Péter-t.
           Anna beat-DEF.3SG Peter-ACC
           'Anna is beating Peter.'

      b.   A   gyerek-ek ver-eked-nek   (egymás-sal).
           the child-ren beat-REFL-3PL each-other-INS
           'The children are fighting (with each other).'

1.7.2. The scope of reciprocity

Like reflexives, the reciprocal is restricted to clausemate antecedents.

(406)   A fiúk$_i$ tudták,   hogy a   lányok$_j$ látják   egymás-t$_{*i/j}$.
           the boys knew.DEF that   the girls   see.DEF each-other-ACC
           'The boys knew that the girls see each other.'

1.7.4. The syntactic positions of the reciprocal

Similarly to the reflexive, the reciprocal can occur in (a) topic, (b) *is*-phrase, (c) focus, and (d) postverbal positions.

(407) a. Egymás-t a fiúk nem látták.
each-other the boys not saw.DEF
'The boys didn't see each other.'

   b. A fiúk egymás-t is látták.
'The boys saw each other, too.'

   c. A fiúk nem **egymás-t** látták.
'The boys didn't see **each other**.'

   d. A fiúk látták egymás-t.
'The boys saw each other.'

1.7.5. Antecedent–reciprocal relations

As in 1.6.5., in the section titles below the first term stands for the antecedent, the second for the reciprocal. Functions omitted either do not exist in Hungarian or no reciprocal is possible in those functions.

   It is to be noted that reciprocals are significantly more acceptable in various positions in which reflexives had to be placed in focus to achieve similar results.

1.7.5.1. Subject – direct object

This configuration is possible as illustrated above in 1.7.4, example (407).

1.7.5.2. Subject – modifier of direct object

Possessor reciprocals are possible, but in complement position they are ruled out, just like reflexives.

(408) a. A lányok szeretik egymás barát-a-i-t.
the girls like.DEF each-other friend-POSS-PL-ACC
'The girls like each other's friends.'

   b. *A lányok szeretik a képek-et egymás-ról.
the girls like.DEF the pictures-ACC each-other-DEL
'The girls like the pictures of each other.'

1.7.5.3. and 1.7.5.5. Subject – indirect object

Dative- or adposition-marked indirect objects can be reciprocals.

(409) a. A fiúk küldték a   könyveket egymás-nak.
          the boys sent.DEF the books   each-other-DAT
          'The boys sent books to each other.'

      b. A fiúk küldték a   könyveket egymás   számára
          the boys sent.DEF the books.ACC each-other for
          'The boys sent books to each other.'

1.7.5.4. and 1.7.5.6. Subject – modifier of indirect object

Possessor reciprocals are grammatical in indirect objects.

(410) a. A fiúk küldtek könyveket egymás
          the boys sent   books.ACC each-other

          barát-a-i–nak.
          friend-POSS-PL-DAT
          'The boys sent books to each other's friends.'

      b. A fiúk küldtek könyveket egymás   barát-a-i
          the boys sent   books.ACC each-other friend-POSS-PL

          részére
          for
          'The boys sent books to each other's friends.'

1.7.5.7–8. Subject – (modifier of) copular complement

The reciprocal is impossible as a copular complement, although it is
perfectly acceptable as a possessive modifier in such positions.

(411) a. *A fiúk egymás voltak.
          'The boys were each other.'

      b. A fiúk egymás   legjobb barát-a-i   voltak.
          the boys each-other best   friend-POSS-PL were
          'The boy's were each other's best friends.'

1.7.5.9–10. Subject – (modifier of) subject-complement

The distribution is similar to what is seen immediately above.

(412) a. *A fiúk egymás maradtak.
          'The boys remained each other.'

      b. A fiúk egymás legjobb barátai maradtak.
          'The boys remained each other's best friends.'

1.7.5.11–12. Subject – (modifier of) object-complement

(413)   A   lányok$_i$ a   fiúk-at   egymás$_i$ vőlegényei-vé
         the girls   the boys-ACC each-other's fiancés-TRA

         tették.
         made.DEF
         'The girls made the boys each other's fiancés.'

1.7.5.13–14. Subject – (modifier of) object of adjective

These configurations are grammatical.

(414) a.   A   lányok elégedettek egymás-sal.
           the girls   content   each-other-INS
           'The girls are content with each other.'

      b.   A   lányok elégedettek egymás   barátaival.
           the girls   content   each-other friends.POSS.INS
           'The girls are content with each other's friends.'

1.7.5.17. Subject – case-marked and adpositional phrase

As in the case of reflexives, the subject can serve as antecedent for a reciprocal in all of the case-marked complement or adverbial phrases, provided there are no independent restrictions against, e.g., referential NPs in them, and in both subtypes of postpositional NPs, whether containing case-like or real postpositions.

(415) a.   A   fiúk   egymás-ra   gondoltak
           the boys each.other-SUB thought
           'The boys thought of each other.'

      b.   A   lányok egymás-ra   öntötték a   vizet.
           the girls   each.other-SUB spilled   the water.ACC
           'The girls spilled the water on each other.'

      c.   *A fiúk   egymás-ként   érkeztek.
           the boys each.other-FOR came
           'The boys came in the function of each other.'

(416) a.   A   lányok egymás   után érkeztek.
           the girls   each.other after came
           'The girls came one after the other.'

      b.   A   fiúk   egymás-sal   szemben állnak.
           the boys each.other-INS opposite stand
           'The boys are standing facing each other.'

1.7.5.18. Subject – modifier of case-marked and adpositional phrase

(417) a. A   fiúk egymás   ellenségei-ről   beszéltek.
           the boys each.other enemies.POSS-DEL talked
           'The boys talked of each other's enemies.'

     b. A   fiúk egymás   barátai-val   együtt érkeztek.
          the boys each.other friends.POSS-INS together came
          'The boys came together with each other's friends.'

1.7.5.19–36. Modifier of subject – other constituents

No modifier or complement in the subject can be the antecedent of a
reciprocal in the clause, even if it is in a position acceptable for reflexive
pronouns, such as the copular complement.

(418) a. *A   fiúk_i barát-a-i   látták   egymás-t_i.
           the boys friend-POSS-PL saw.DEF each.other-ACC
           'The boys'_i friends saw each other_i.'

     b. *A   könyvek a   fiúk-ról   tetszettek egymás-nak.
          the books   the boys-DEL pleased   each.other-DAT
          'The books about the boys pleased each other.'

     c. *A   fiúk legjobb barát-a-i   egymás   volt(ak).
          the boys best   friend-POSS-PL each.other was/were
          'The boys' best friends were each other.'

1.7.5.37. Direct object – subject

No coreference relations are possible between an antecedent in object posi-
tion and a reciprocal in subject position. In fact, the reciprocal cannot,
under any condition, occur in subject position. Even a focussed reciprocal
is unacceptable, as shown by the example below.

(419)   *A   fiúkat   **egymás**   mutatta   be.
          the boys-ACC each.other introduced.DEF PFX
          'Each other introduced the boys.'

1.7.5.38. Direct object – modifier of subject

In contrast with the prohibition against reciprocals in subject position,
their occurrence in the possessive modifier of the subject is quite accept-
able, provided the reciprocal follows the antecedent.

(420) a.   **?Egymás barátai** mutatták be a fiúk-at.
         each.other friends.POSS introduced.DEF PFX the boys-ACC

    b.   A fiúk-at **egymás barátai** mutatták be.
         'The boys were introduced by each other's friends.'

1.7.5.39–40. Direct object – (modifier of) indirect object

Since (apart from the subject) all constituents are lower in the hierarchy than the direct object, antecedents in this position are compatible with reciprocals in the rest of the syntactic functions.

(421) a.   Be-mutattam egymás-nak a fiúk–at.
         PFX-introduced.DEF.1SG each.other-DAT the boys-ACC
         'I introduced the boys to each other.'

    b.   Bemutattam egymás tanár-a-i-nak a fiúk-at.
                          teacher-POSS-PL-DAT
         'I introduced the boys to each other's teachers.'

1.7.5.49. Direct object – object of adjective

This is again a possible configuration.

(422)   A lányok-at egymás-sal elégedett-nek láttam.
        the girls-ACC each.other-INS content-DAT saw.DEF.1SG
        'I regarded the girls as content with each other.'

1.7.5.55–72. Modifier of direct object – other constituents

No coreference is possible.

(423) a.   *A lányok$_i$ barát-a-i-t bemutattam
         the girls friend-POSS-PL-ACC introduced.DEF.1SG

         egymás-nak$_i$.
         each.other-DAT
         'I introduced the girls'$_i$ friends to each other$_i$.'

    b.   *A könyv-et a lányok-ról kértem
         the book-ACC the girls-DEL requested.DEF.1SG

         egymás-tól.
         each.other-ABL
         'I requested the book about the girls from each other.'

1.7.5.73. Indirect object – subject

Since the antecedent is lower in the hierarchy than the phrase containing the reciprocal, coreference is not possible.

(424)   *A fiúk-nak egymás   mutatta   be   a   lányok-at.
          the boys-DAT each.other introduced.DEF PFX the girls-ACC
          'Each other introduced the girls to the boys.'

1.7.5.74. Indirect object – modifier of subject

This is again a possible configuration if the subject is in focus.

(425)   A fiúk-nak$_i$ **egymás**$_i$ **barátai** mutatták   be   a
          the boys-DAT each.other's friends introduced.DEF PFX the

          lányok-at.
          girls-ACC
          'Each other's friends introduced the boys to the girls.'

1.7.5.75 – 76. Indirect object – (modifier of) direct object

É. Kiss (1987) finds the reciprocal in direct object more acceptable than other speakers, and marks it by a question mark. The structure again improves if focussed.

(426) a.   ?*A lányok-nak bemutattam.DEF egymás-t.
           the girls-DAT   introduced.1SG each.other-ACC

      b.   A lányok-nak **egymás-t** mutattam be.
           'I introduced each other to the girls.'

The reciprocal in the object modifier yields an acceptable structure.

(427)   Bemutattam   a   lányok-nak egymás   barátai-t.
          introduced.DEF.1SG the girls-DAT each.other's friends-ACC
          'I introduced each other's friends to the girls.'

1.7.5.77–78. Indirect object – (modifier of) case-marked or adpositional NP

All configurations included here are possible.

(428) a.   Beszéltem a   lányok-nak egymás-ról.
           spoke.1SG the girls-DAT   each.other-DEL
           'I spoke to the girls about each other.'

      b.   Érveltem   a   lányok-nak egymás   ellen.
           argued.1SG the girls-DAT   each.other against
           'I argued to the girls against each other.'

(429) a. Beszéltem a   lányok-nak egymás   barátai-ról.
          spoke.1SG the girls-DAT   each.other friends.POSS-DEL
          'I spoke to the girls about each other's friends.'

      b. Érveltem   a   lányok-nak egymás   barátai   ellen.
          argued.1SG the lányok-nak   each.other friends.POSS against
          'I argued to the girls against each other's friends.'

1.7.5.89–104. Modifier of indirect object – other constituents

When the antecedent is the modifier of the indirect object coreference
is not possible either "upwards" or "downwards" in the hierarchy of
syntactic functions.

(430) a. *A lányok könyvei-nek örült-(ek)   egymás.
           the girls' books-DAT rejoiced-(PL) each.other
           'Each other rejoiced over the girls' books.'

      b. *A lányok barátai-nak ígértem   egymás-t.
           the girls' friends-DAT promised.DEF.1SG each.other-ACC
           'I promised each other to the girls' friends.'

      c. *A lányok; barátai-nak beszéltem egymás-ról;
           the girls'   friends-DAT spoke.1SG each.other-DEL
           'I spoke to the girls' friends about each other.'

1.7.5.173–175. Case-marked or adpositional phrase – subject/object

Since the reciprocal is higher in the hierarchy, coreference is not possible
even if the reciprocal is in focus.

(431) a. *A lányok-ról **egymás**   beszél a   legtöbbet.
           the girls-DEL each.other speaks the most
           'Each other speaks the most about the girls.'

      b. *A lányok-ról **egymás-t**   kérdeztem.
           the girls-DEL each.other-ACC asked.DEF.1SG
           'I asked each other about the girls.'

1.7.5.177. Case-marked or adpositional phrase – indirect object

This is possible even in neutral sentences.

(432)   Üzenetek érkeztek a   lányok-tól egymás-nak
          messages came   the girls-ABL each.other-DAT
          'Messages were coming from the girls to each other.'

1.7.5.191. Case-marked or adpositional phrase – case-marked or adpositional phrase

As in the case of reflexives, coreference relations in two similar phrases are possible with some restrictions owing to closer or more distant lexical government relations. It appears that at least the antecedent has to be lexically governed. Moreover, if one of the phrases is not in a lexical relation with the predicate, focussing may sometimes circumvent difficulties.

(433) a. ?Beszéltem a   fiúk-kal   egymás-ról.
          spoke.1SG the boys-INS each.other-DEL
          'I spoke with the boys about each other.'

      b. ??Beszéltem a fiúk-ról egymás-sal.
          'I spoke about the boys with each other.'

      c. ?A fiúk-ról **egymás-sal** beszéltem.
          'It was with each other that I spoke about the boys.'

(434) a. ?A fiúk-kal **egymás   miatt**   beszéltem.
          the boys-INS each.other because spoke.1SG
          'I spoke with the boys because of each other.'

      b. *A fiúk miatt **egymás-sal** beszéltem.
          'I spoke because of the boys with each other.'

Postpositional phrases are more acceptable as antecedents if they are in a closer lexical government relation with the verb than the reciprocal.

(435) a. ??A fiúk iránt **egymás   miatt**   érez Péter szeretet-et.
          the boys for   each.other because feel Peter affection-ACC
          'Peter feels an affection for the boys because of each other.'

      b. *A fiúk miatt **egymás iránt** érez Péter szeretetet.
          'Peter feels an affection because of the boys for each other.'

1.7.5.193–212. Modifier of case-marked or adpositional phrase – other constituents

These are not possible coreference relations.

(436) a. *A fiúk_i barátai-tól   egymás-nak_i   érkeztek üzenetek.
          the boys' friends-ABL each.other-DAT came   messages
          'Messages were coming in from the boys'_i friends to each other.'

      b. *A fiúk házai-tól   sokat kell menni   egymás-ig.
          the boys' houses-ABL much must walk.INF each.other-TER
          'There is a lot to walk from the boys' houses to each other.'

1.7.6. Reciprocals in nominalized clauses

Reciprocals are also possible in action nominalizations in the same way as reflexives.

(437) a.   a   fiúk   töröd-és-e   egymás-sal
            the boys care-ing-POSS each.other-DAT
            'the boys' caring for each other'

     b.   a   fiúk   egymás-sal   való   töröd-és-e
            the boys each.other-INS being care-ing-POSS
            'the boys' caring for each other'

     c.   a   fiúk   egymás   által való   elítél-és-e
            the boys each.other by   being judge-ing-POSS
            'the boys' judgment by each other'

Since possessor NPs are in a c-commanding position, they cannot be reciprocals.

(438)   *egymás-(nak) a fiúk által való elítélése
          'each other's judgment by the boys'

1.7.7. Reciprocals in ordinary NPs

Coreference relations between NPs and reciprocals are possible also in NPs formed of result nominals or lexical nouns.

(439) a.   a   fiúk   ítélet-e-i   egymás   ellen
            the boys' sentence-POSS-PL each.other against
            'the boys' sentences against each other'

     b.   [A fiúk   kép-e-i   egymás-ról]   jól   sikerültek.
            the boys' picture-POSS-PL each.other-DEL well succeeded
            'The boys' pictures of each other were a success.'

1.7.8. Reciprocals without overt antecedents

In this case, reciprocals in so-called picture nominals that have no antecedents are acceptable with some predicates, but in general are not coreferential. The NPs in which the reciprocal has a (covert or overt) possessive antecedent are always grammatical.

(440) a.   A   lányok-nak tetszettek [a   képek   egymás-ról]
            the girls-DAT   pleased   the pictures each.other-DEL
            'The girls liked the pictures of each other.'

   b.   *A lányok a   falra   akasztották [a képek-et
       the girls   the wall.SUB hung.DEF the pictures-ACC

       egymás-ról]
       each.other-DEL
       'The girls hung the pictures of each other on the wall.'

   c.   A lányok a falra akasztották [a   képeik-et   egymás-ról]
                                             their pictures-ACC
       'The girls hung their pictures of each other on the wall.'

1.8. COMPARISON

1.8.1. Means for expressing comparison

There are two constructions available for the expression of comparison: one of them contains the standard in a (usually elliptic) clause, the other in a case-marked noun phrase. The comparative of adjectives and adverbs is formed by means of the suffix -*bb*, and that of the quantifier or numeral *sok* 'many, much' is the irregular *több* 'more'. "Reverse" comparison is expressed by using *kevésbé* 'less' and the parameter (adjective or adverb) of comparison in construction with the clause containing the standard.

1.8.1.1. Clausal comparative

The full form of the clausal comparative construction is composed of the parameter of comparison (an adjective, numeral, or adverb) in the comparative form, an appropriate relative pro-form, the conjunction or complementizer *mint* 'as, than', and the standard of comparison in a clause. Although it is not ungrammatical, the full form is rarely ever used; for more on this, see below.

(441) a.   Anna érdekes-ebb,   mint amilyen érdekes   Péter volt.
         Anna interesting-CMP than what   interesting Peter was
         'Anna is more interesting than Peter was.'

    b.   Anna érdekesebb, mint Péter.
         'Anna is more interesting than Peter.'

(442) a.   Anna több könyv-et   olvas, mint amennyi   könyv-et
         Anna more book-ACC reads than how-many book-ACC

       Péter olvas.
       Peter reads
       'Anna reads more books than Peter does.'

b. Anna több könyvet olvas, mint Péter.
    'Anna reads more books than Peter.'

(443) a. Anna gyors-abb-an   olvas, mint amilyen gyorsan   Péter
          Anna fast-CMP-ADV reads than how   fast-ADV Peter

          olvas.
          reads.
          'Anna reads faster than Peter does.'

b. Anna gyorsabban olvas, mint Péter.
    'Anna reads faster than Peter.'

It is possible to have different items as apparent parameters in the two clauses, but in this case the actual parameter is some common measure (e.g., length or number). In the structures in question the relative pro-form cannot be omitted.

(444) a. A   polc hossz-abb, mint *(amilyen) széles a   szoba.
          The shelf long-er   than what   wide the room
          'The shelf is longer than the room is wide.'

b. *A polc hossz-abb, mint a szoba széles.

(445)   Anna több könyv-et   olvasott, mint *(amennyi) cikk-et
          Anna more book-ACC read   than how-many article-ACC

          Péter írt.
          Peter wrote
          'Anna has read more books than Peter has written articles.'

If two predicates are compared, the subtype of clausal comparative applied is the analytic construction formed by means of the unanalyzable *inkább* 'rather, more' and the predicates.

(446) a. Anna inkább írja,   mint olvassa   a   könyvek–et.
          Anna rather writes.DEF than reads.DEF the books-ACC
          'Anna writes, rather than reads, books.'

b. Péter inkább könyvek-et, mint cikkek-et   ír.
    Peter rather books-ACC than articles-ACC writes
    'Peter writes books rather than articles.'

"Reverse" comparatives are also clausal, and occur in analytic constructions.

(447) a. Anna kevésbé érdekes,   mint Péter.
          Anna less   interesting than Peter
          'Anna is less interesting than Peter.'

b.   Anna kevésbé gyors-an olvas, mint Péter.
     Anna less   fast-ADV reads than Peter
     'Anna reads less fast than Peter.'

1.8.1.2. Case-marked comparative

In this construction-type the standard of comparison is marked by the adessive case, otherwise used to express adjacency to some place, rendered commonly as 'at' in English.

(448) a.   Anna érdekes-ebb   volt Péter-nél.
            Anna interesting-CMP was Peter-ADE
            'Anna was more interesting than Peter.'

       b.   Anna gyors-abb-an   olvas Péter-nél.
            Anna fast-CMP-ADV reads Peter-ADE
            'Anna reads faster than Peter.'

       c.   Anna több könyv-et   olvasott Péter-nél.
            Anna more book-ACC read   Peter-ADE
            'Anna has read more books than Peter.'

This structure does not allow a change of adjective, even if the standard is nominalized.

(449)   *?A polc hossz-abb a   szoba széles-ség-é-nél.
            the shelf long-CMP the room wide-NML-POSS-ADE
            'The shelf is longer than the room's width.'

1.8.2–5. Ellipsis in comparative constructions

Identical elements can, but need not, be deleted in the subordinate clause. Even though the full construction appears to be overextended, and therefore awkward, it is perfectly possible to repeat them in the clause, especially if other constituents differ.

(450) a.   Anna több könyv-et   olvasott, mint amennyi   (könyv)–ről
            Anna more book-ACC read   than how-many book-DEL

            Péter valahais   álmodott.
            Peter ever   CL dreamed
            'Anna has read more books than Peter has ever dreamed of.'

b. Anna több könyv-et olvasott, mint (amennyi (könyve)-t)
    Anna more book-ACC read   than how-many book-ACC

Péter <olvasott>.
Peter read
'Anna has read more books than Peter (has).'

Note that in the last example the verb in the comparative clause can occur only if the relative pro-form (with or without the rest of its NP) is present, as is signalled by the angled brackets around the verb. If the verb is missing, the relative pro-form can also be omitted. Thus, in the clausal construction-type the complementizer and the standard must be present; all other constituents, including the relative pro-form, are optional, though they are usually deleted. As was indicated above, the case-marked comparative can only contain the standard, thus no questions of deletion arise.

The differences between the two constructions follow from their fundamental syntactic properties. On the one hand, the case-marked subtype can only have NPs as standards, in contrast with the clausal type, which allows for various kinds of other standards as well, as was seen above. On the other hand, the case-marked comparative can be easily embedded in structures of premodification, which is not possible for the clausal subtype, since right-branching structures cannot be embedded inside left-branching ones.

(451) a. Péter [Anná-nál érdekes-ebb   emberek könyvei–t]
           Peter Anna-ADE interesting-CMP people's books-ACC

           olvasta.
           read.DEF
           'Peter has read books by people more interesting than Anna.'

      b. *Péter [érdekes-ebb   mint Anna emberek könyvei-t]
                  interesting-CMP than Anna

           olvasta.

1.8.6 Correlative comparison

The paired elements *mi-nél* ... *an-nál* 'what-ADE ... that-ADE' are the markers of correlative comparative constructions. As shown by the glosses, they constitute a relative vs. main clause construction, similar to what was seen in clausal comparatives.

(452) a. Mi-nél   érdekes-ebb   a könyv, an-nál   hossz-abb.
           what-ADE interesting-CMP the book   that-ADE long-CMP
           'The more interesting the book is, the longer it is.'

b. Mi-nél   több-et   olvasok, an-nál   keves-ebb-et
what-ADE more-ACC read.1SG that-ADE little-CMP-ACC
tudok.
know.1SG
'The more I read, the less I know.'

1.9. EQUATIVES

1.9.1. Means for expressing equation

Equatives are solely expressed by means of the clausal construction intro-
duced by the complementizer *mint* 'as, than' and a relative pro-form in the
clause, and by various demonstrative items in the main clause. That it is
the same type of construction as the clausal comparative is evidenced by
the optional presence of identical relative pro-forms. The predicates in
angled brackets can be present only if the relative proforms in parentheses
occur.

(453) a. Anna olyan érdekes,   mint (amilyen (érdekes)) Péter <volt
Anna as   interesting as   how   interesting Peter was

tavaly>.
last-year
'Anna is as interesting as Peter (was last year).'

b. Anna annyi   könyv-et   olvasott, mint (amennyi
Anna as-many book-ACC read   as   how-many

(könyve)-t) Péter <írt>.
book-ACC Peter wrote
'Anna has read as many books as Peter (wrote).

c. Anna olyan gyors-an olvas, mint (amilyen gyors-an/ahogy)
Anna so   fast-ADV reads as   how   fast-ADV/how

Péter <ír>.
Peter writes
'Anna reads as fast as Peter (writes).'

1.9.2. Ellipsis in equatives

As was indicated in the above examples, identical constituents can, but
need not, be deleted. Different items must, of course, be overt.

Although only the optional omission of the relative pro-forms was
indicated in the examples above, in fact it is either the complementizer
mint or the relative pro-form that can be deleted in equatives – unlike
comparatives, cf.:

(454) a. Anna olyan érdekes,   amilyen (érdekes) Péter (volt
        Anna as   interesting how   interesting Peter was

        tavaly).
        last-year
        'Anna is as interesting as Peter (was last year).'

    b. Anna annyi   könyv-et olvasott, amennyi (könyve)-t
        Anna as-many book-ACC read   how-many book-ACC

        Péter (írt).
        Peter wrote
        'Anna has read as many books as Peter (wrote).'

    c. Anna olyan gyors-an olvas, amilyen gyors-an/ahogy Péter
        Anna so   fast-ADV reads how   fast-ADV/how   Peter

        (ír).
        writes
        'Anna reads as fast as Peter (writes).'

1.9.3. Expression of identity

It is the equative construction that serves to express identity statements
formed by means of the prefix *ugyan-* 'same', which can be added to
various demonstratives introducing clauses, such as *az* 'that', *olyan* 'such,
so', *úgy* 'that-way'. Note that the slash in parentheses indicates the
occurrence of either or both of the items separated by it.

(455) a. Anna ugyan-olyan, mint(/) amilyen   Péter.
        Anna same-such   as   what-like Peter
        'Anna is like Peter.'

    b. Anna ugyan-az-t   olvassa,   mint(/) ami-t   Péter.
        Anna same-that-ACC reads.DEF as   what-ACC Peter
        'Anna is reading the same thing as Peter.'

    c. Anna ugyan-olyan gyors-an olvas, mint(/) ahogy Péter.
        Anna same-so   fast-ADV reads as   how   Peter
        'Anna reads at the same rate as Peter.'

1.10. POSSESSION

1.10.1. Sentences expressing possession

Of the two structures available for languages of the world, i.e., *have-* and
be-sentences, Hungarian uses the latter type exclusively to express posses-
sion. According to the widely accepted analysis in Szabolcsi (1986/1992,

1994), this construction originates in a possessive noun phrase, from which the dative possessor is extracted for reasons of specificity. She argues that the object of possession in sentences expressing possession (or "possessional sentences" for short) must be nonspecific, and if the possessor stays in the possessive NP it can only be specific, as shown by the (in)definite conjugation in this language.

(456) a.   Nem olvast-ad/*olvast-ál   [Péter vers-é-t]
           not read-2SG.DEF/read-2SG.INDEF Peter poem-POSS-ACC
           'You haven't read Peter's poem.'

      b.   Péter-nek   nem olvast-ad/olvast-ál [vers-é-t]
           Peter-DAT
           'You haven't read any poem by Peter.'
           'You haven't read Peter's poem.' (archaic)

By extracting the possessor in an existential sentence, it is possible to satisfy the "nonspecificity criterion" possessional sentences have to observe.

(457) a.   *Van [Péter vers-e]
           is   Peter poem-POSS

      b.   Péter-nek   van vers-e.
           Peter-DAT is   poem-POSS
           'Peter has a poem.'

      c.   *Van-nak [Péter vers-e-i]
           is-PL   Peter poem-POSS-PL

      d.   Péter-nek van-nak vers-e-i.
           'Peter has (some) poems.'

   Since the possessive noun phrase shows concord between the possessor and the agreement marker on the possessed noun, the existential predicate *van* 'is' agrees only in number with the possessed head of the noun phrase, which in turn agrees with the possessor in number and person, in addition to its own number expressed by the possessive plural affix -*i*.

(458) a.   Nek-em   van vers-e-m.
           DAT-1SG is   poem-POSS-1SG
           'I have a poem.'

      b.   Nek-em   van-nak vers-e-i-m.
           DAT-1SG is-PL   poem-POSS-PL-1SG
           'I have poems.'

c. Nek-ed   van vers-e-d.
DAT-2SG is   poem-POSS-2SG
'You have a poem.'

d. Nek-ed   van-nak vers-e-i-d.
DAT-2SG is-PL   poem-POSS-PL-2SG
'You have poems.'

e. Nek-i   van vers-e
DAT-3SG is   poem-POSS.3SG
'S/he has a poem.'

f. Nek-i   van-nak vers-e-i
DAT-3SG is-PL   poem-POSS.3SG-PL
'S/he has poems.'

g. Nek-ünk van vers-ünk.
DAT-1PL is   poem-POSS.1PL
'We have a poem.'

h. Nek-ünk van-nak vers-e-i-nk.
DAT-1PL is-PL   poem-POSS-PL-1PL
'We have poems.'

i. Nek-tek   van vers-e-tek.
DAT-2PL is   poem-POSS-2PL
'You have a poem.'

j. Nek-tek   van-nak vers-e-i-tek.
DAT-2PL is-PL   poem-POSS-PL-2PL
'You have poems.'

k. Nek-ik   van vers-ük.
DAT-3PL is   poem-POSS.3PL
'They have a poem.'

l. Nek-ik   van-nak vers-e-i-k.
DAT-3PL is-PL   poem-POSS-PL-3PL
'They have poems.'

Note that, in accordance with the rules of omission of pronouns in general and in possessive constructions in particular, the pronominal possessors in all of the examples above can be suppressed. Obviously, the possessed object can be modified by an adjectival phrase, a numeral, or by any other means possible for such nominals provided they remain nonspecific. Furthermore, negated possessional sentences are formed with the third person forms of the (suppletive) negative counterpart of the verb of existence, i.e., *nincs(en)* 'not is' and *nincsenek* 'not are', while future and past tenses

are expressed by *lesz(-nek)* 'will-be(-PL)' and *volt(-ak)* 'was/were', respectively.

(459) a.   (Nek-em) nincs sok   vers-e-m.
        DAT-1SG not-is many poem-POSS-1SG
        'I don't have many poems.'

     b.   (Nek-tek) nem lesznek érdekes   vers-e-i-tek.
        DAT-2PL not will-be interesting poem-POSS-PL-2PL
        'You won't have interesting poems.'

Finally, mention must be made of possessional sentences with nonpronominal third person plural possessors, since they have two inflectional versions, of which the plural variety is the same as the one with the pronominal possessor, while the one with the singular suffix follows the inflection used inside the noun phrase, and is labelled as nonstandard, though it is widely used even in educated Hungarian.

(460) a.   [A fiúk-nak   a   vers-e/*vers-ük]   érdekes   volt.
        the boys-DAT the poem-3SG/poem-3PL interesting was
        'The boys' poem was interesting.'

     b.   A fiúk-nak volt egy érdekes %vers-e/vers-ük.
        'The boys had an interesting poem.'

1.10.2–5. Restrictions in possessional sentences

There are, in general, no differences in the expression of alienable vs. inalienable, temporary vs. permanent, present vs. past possession, or between the expression of possession of persons, animals, or things. The same *be*-sentence is used in all types, though minor differences can be discerned.

For example, paired body parts (and paired objects associated with them) are often referred to in the singular, which is related to perceiving every paired organ as a single "whole". Note here that a one-eyed or one-legged person is usually referred to as "half-eyed" or "half-legged".

(461) a.   Péter-nek jó   szem-e   van.
        Peter-DAT good eye-POSS.3SG is
        'Peter has good eyes.'

     b.   Anna levette a   cipő-jé-t.
        Anna took-off the shoe-POSS.3SG-ACC
        'Anna took off her shoes.'

Some relations are so much tied to possessive constructions or possessional sentences that the possessed noun, which expresses the relation

itself, has no "stem-form", i.e., the possessive suffix has become part of the word-form that underlies all of its inflected forms.

(462) a. Anná-nak van báty-ja/húg-a.
          Anna-DAT is   brother-POSS/sister-POSS
          'Anna has an (elder) brother/(younger) sister.'

     b. *A báty/húg . . .

Szabolcsi (1986/1992), following Hadrovics (1969), summarized the relationship between possessive noun phrases and possessional sentences. Compare the following list, in which the relations represented are (a) possession, (b) relation, (c) part–whole, (d) *measure, (e) source, (f) *property, (g) *action nominalization, (h) agent–object, (i) *identity, (j) *ad hoc relation. Starred subtypes are not possible as possessional sentences.

(463) a. Péter verse   Péternek van verse.
          'Peter's poem'   'Peter has a poem.'

     b. Péter húga   Péternek van húga.
          'Peter's sister'   'Peter has a sister.'

     c. az asztal lába   Az asztalnak van lába.
          'the table's leg'   'The table has legs.'

     d. a tej literje   *A tejnek van literje.
          'a liter of (the) milk' *'Milk has liter(s).'

     e. a vad nyoma   A vadnak van nyoma.
          'the beast's trace'   'The beast has a trace.'

     f. a diadal mámora   *A diadalnak van mámora.
          'the ecstasy of triumph' *'Triumph has ecstasy.'

     g. Péter megvizsgálása   *Péternek van megvizsgálása.
          'Peter's examination'   *'Peter has examination.'

     h. Péter üldözője   Péternek van üldözője.
          'Peter's pursuer'   'Peter has a pursuer.'

     i. London városa   *Londonnak van városa.
          'London's town'   *'London has a town.'

     j. Péter minisztere   *Péternek van minisztere.
          'Peter's minister'   *'Peter has a minister.'
          (e.g., the minister that he
          talked about)

Finally, as regards past vs. present possession, it is possible to use a possessional sentence in the present tense with reference to what is appar-

ently past possession if the sentence is used to predicate some property of
the possessed nominal, as Szabolcsi (1986/1992) reports.

(464) a.   *Lord Byron-nak   van kalap-ja.
             Lord   Byron-DAT is   hat-POSS
             'Lord Byron has a hat.'

       b.   Lord Byron-nak van olyan kalap-ja, amelyet   nem
                                   such   which.ACC not

             állítottak   ki.
             exhibited.3PL PFX
             'Lord Byron has a hat that hasn't been exhibited.'

1.11. EMPHASIS

1.11.1. Sentence emphasis

Emphasis in Hungarian, whether contrastive or noncontrastive, or
whether related to the sentence as a whole or limited to one or more
constituents, is associated with the position of the inflected verb and is
expressed by means of varying the constituent order and assigning stress
to some distinguished element. Emphasis is usually discussed under the
term "focus" in current literature and has been extensively studied
(among others) by É. Kiss (1987, 1994), Horvath (1986), Brody (1990, 1995)
from a syntactic point of view, and by Kálmán and Nádasdy (1994) in an
approach based on prosodic phonology. Wherever relevant, emphasis/
focus is marked by bold type, as throughout in this chapter.

1.11.1.1. Noncontradictory emphasis

The neutral Subject–Verb–Object/Complement order of sentences con-
taining definite noun phrases is changed for a verb-initial one in case a
presentative or presentational sentence is called for to highlight the
current occurrence of the event or the emergence, rise, coming into sight,
etc., of the thing/person talked about.

(465) a.   *neutral*
             A   vendégek meg-érkeztek a   szállodába.
             the guests   PFX-arrived   the hotel.ILL
             'The guests have arrived in the hotel.'

       b.   *presentative*
             Megérkeztek a vendégek a szállodába.
             ca. 'Guests have arrived in the hotel.'

(466) a. *neutral*
A   nap fel-kelt.
the sun PFX-rose
'The sun has risen.'

   b. *presentative*
Felkelt a nap.
'The **sun** has risen.'

Another subtype is called "existential" sentences, since they point at the previous occurrence of the event, that is, they claim that there has already occurred an event characterized by the proposition. They are distinguished by a reversal of the prefix–verb order if the verb has a prefix, and a heavy stress on the verb. Note that the verb need not be initial, though it most often is.

(467) a. *neutral*
Péter el-felejtett   fontos   feladatokat.
Peter PFX-forgot important assignments.ACC
'Peter forgot/has forgotten important assignments.'

   b. *existential*
Felejtett el (már)   Péter fontos feladatokat.
                already
'(It has occurred before that) Peter has forgotten important assignments.'

   c. *existential*
Péter **felejtett** (már) el fontos feladatokat.
'(It has occurred before that) Peter has forgotten important assignments.'

1.11.1.2. *Contradictory emphasis*

Emphatic sentences expressing contradiction are marked by heavy stress on the verb, but they differ from existential sentences in that they do not reverse the prefix–verb order. A small number of words can be used to enhance the assertion. This is the only context in which almost all verbs, even auxiliaries, can be emphatic in Hungarian. (The only exception is discussed directly in 1.11.2.2.1.3. Note that auxiliaries have to precede the infinitives they govern, which they otherwise follow.)

(468)   Péter (igenis) **el-felejtett** fontos   feladatokat.
Peter indeed PFX-forgot important assignments
'Peter **has**/has indeed forgotten important assignments.' = 'It is not true that Peter hasn't forgotten important documents.'

(469) a.   Péter olvasni   fog.
           Peter read.INF will
           'Peter will be reading.'

      b.   Péter **fog** olvasni.
           'Peter **will** be reading.'

1.11.2. Constituent emphasis

1.11.2.1. Noncontrastive emphasis

Noncontrastive constituent emphasis is almost nonexistent in Hungarian, since all emphatic items must be placed in a preverbal position – unless of course it is the verb itself. However, if for some reason the preverbal position is inaccessible, it is possible to place emphasis on a postverbal element, in which case it is not interpreted contrastively. Such contexts are regularly produced in commands and questions.

(470) a.   Olvasd   el   **ezt** a   könyvet!
           read.IMP.DEF PFX this the book.ACC
           'Read **this** book (. . . if you like).'

      b.   Ki   olvasta   **ezt** a   könyvet?
           who read.DEF this the book.ACC
           'Who has read **this** book?'

1.11.2.2. Contrastive emphasis

Contrastive constituent emphasis (or contrastive focus) is realized by (a) placing the constituent immediately in front of the (prefixless) inflected verb, (b) placing the constituent in question directly in front of the prefixed verb but removing the prefix from its preverbal position, or (c) if the emphasis falls on the inflected verb itself, by retaining the prefix (if any) in front of the verb, and in all cases stressing the item carrying the emphasis. Note that the relative prosodic prominence is achieved in fact by destressing the constituents following the emphatic item (cf. Vogel and Kenesei 1987, 1990, Kálmán and Nádasdy 1994).

(471) a.   *neutral*
           Péter olvasta   a   könyvet.
           Peter read.DEF the book.ACC
           'Peter read/was reading the book.'

   b. *neutral*
      Péter el-olvasta   a   könyvet.
      Peter PFX-read.DEF the book.ACC
      'Peter read/has read the book.'

(472) a.   Péter **a könyvet** olvasta.
           'It's the book that Peter read.'

      b.   **Péter** olvasta el a könyvet.
           'It's Peter that has read the book.'

      c.   Péter **(el-)olvasta** a könyvet.
           'Peter **read** the book (. . . rather than burned it).'

Negated emphatic constituents are also placed preverbally and are pre-
ceded by the negation word *nem* 'not', as was discussed in connection
with constituent negation in 1.4.2.

(473) a.   Péter **nem a könyvet** olvasta el.
           'It's not the book that Peter has read.'

      b.   **Nem Péter** olvasta el a könyvet.
           'It's not Peter that has read the book.'

      c.   Péter nem **el-olvasta** a könyvet.
           'Peter has not **read** the book (. . . but burned it).'

In case there is no overt verb in the sentence, i.e., in some of the copular
sentences, cf. 1.2.1.1, the predicate adjective or the nominal serves as the
focussing device that the emphatic constituent must be to the left of and
adjacent to.

(474) a.   Anna **Péter-re**   büszke.
           Anna Peter-SUB proud
           'It's Peter Anna is proud of.'

      b.   Anna **Péter-re** volt büszke.
           'It's Peter Anna was proud of.'

The position in front of the verb can host a single constituent only,
which, however, does not exclude the possibilty of multiple emphasis, as
will be seen below.

There are two (or three) particles that can be called emphatic; one of
them, *csak* 'only', generally occurs in the preverbal focus position, the
other(s), *is* 'too' or *még . . . is* 'even', have more freedom to be preverbal,
but nonadjacent, or postverbal. (*Csak* may occur postverbally, but without
the constituent it is associated with.)

(475) a.   Péter **csak a könyvet** olvasta el.
           'Peter has read only the book.'

b. Péter **a könyvet** olvasta csak el.
    'Peter has read only the book.'

c. Péter **még a könyvet is**   el-olvasta.
    even   CL
    'Peter has read even the book.'

d. Péter el-olvasta **még a könyvet is**.
    'Peter has read even the book.'

Although other devices, such as clefting and pseudo-clefting, are in principle possible, they are rarely used as a means of focussing.

1.11.2.2.1. Elements emphasized

In general, any major constituent in the clause can be moved into the designated focus position, and so can constituents of complement clauses, as will be seen in detail below.

1.11.2.2.1.1. Noun phrase As the examples above illustrate, noun phrases can be emphasized with no difficulty.

1.11.2.2.1.2. Adjective Predicative adjectives are stressed *in situ*, since they occupy a preverbal, i.e., pre-copular, position if there is an overt copula in the clause, and a preverbal position if they are predicate complements, i.e., "verbal modifiers".

(476) a. A   könyv **érdekes**   (volt).
          the book   interesting was
          'The book was **interesting**.'

     b. Anna **simá-ra**   dörzsölte   az asztal-t.
         Anna smooth-SUB rubbed.DEF the table-ACC
         'Anna rubbed the table smooth.'

Attributive adjectives are embedded in noun phrases, and whenever they are emphatic the entire noun phrase has to move into the focus position.

(477)   Péter [az **érdekes**   könyv-et] olvasta   el.
         Peter the interesting book.ACC read.DEF PFX
         'It's the **interesting** book that Peter has read.'

1.11.2.2.1.3. Verb Most verbs, but no auxiliaries, can be contrastively focussed with their prefixes (if any) preceding them, as was discussed above.
    As Komlósy (1994) observed, a class of Hungarian verbs cannot occur

in neutral sentences, i.e., either they are emphasized themselves or some other constituent is placed in the focus position in front of them. This group includes mostly verbs of emotion, e.g., *szeret* 'like', *utál* 'hate', *imád* 'adore', *sajnál* 'pity', *aggaszt* 'worry'; and predicates expressing possibility or ability, e.g., *tud* 'know', *beszél* 'speak', *ír* 'write' (in a language); and *emlékszik* 'remember', *tilos* 'is forbidden', *lehet* 'is possible'.

(478) a. *neutral*
          *Anna szereti   Péter-t.
          Anna likes.DEF Peter-ACC

    b. Anna **szereti** Pétert.
          'Anna **likes** Peter.'

    c. **Anna** szereti Pétert.
          'It's Anna that likes Peter.'

    d. Anna **Pétert** szereti.
          'It's Peter that Anna likes.'

Another class is unemphasized because they express the emergence, formation, or coming-/bringing-into-being, sight, possession, etc., of some person or object in the neutral case, where these items have to be interpreted as nonspecific; consequently these noun phrases must be indefinite, as was first observed by Szabolcsi (1986/1992). If the NP is definite, the only way the sentence can be made acceptable is by focussing some constituent in it. (If the verb is emphatic, it is never contrasted, but carries contradictory sentential emphasis, cf. above.) Examples are *érkezik* 'arrive', *kap* 'receive (= come into possession)', *kerül* 'surface (= come into sight)', *talál* 'find', *rajzol* 'draw (something)'.

(479) a. *neutral*
          Tegnap   vendégek érkeztek a   szálloda-ba.
          yesterday guests   arrived the hotel-ILL
          'Guests arrived in the hotel yesterday.'

    b. A vendégek **tegnap** érkeztek a szálloda-ba.
          'It's yesterday that the guests arrived in the hotel.'

Finally, another group of verbs that cannot be contrasted expresses location or qualification in a complex construction, e.g., *marad* 'remain', *fekszik* 'is situated', *képez* 'constitute', *tart* 'consider'. This is the exceptional verb-class mentioned above, which cannot bear stress if the sentence is in contradictory emphasis; instead, the complement of the verb is stressed and is therefore ambiguous between a sentential emphasis and a constituent constrast.

(480) a. *neutral*
A   könyv fejezetek-ből   áll.
the book   chapters-ELA consists
'The book consists of chapters.'

b. **A könyv** áll fejezetek-ből.
'It's the book that consists of chapters.'

(481) a. *A könyv (igenis) **áll** fejezetek-ből.

b. A könyv (igenis) **fejezetek-ből** áll.
'The book (indeed) consists of chapters.'

1.11.2.2.1.4. Adverbial   One class of adverbials (of frequency, manner, or degree) must be contrastively focussed; they all have negative semantic content (cf. 1.2.1.3.2 and the references cited there).

(482) a. Péter **ritkán** olvasta   el/*el-olvasta a   könyvet.
Peter seldom read.DEF PFX   the book.ACC
'Peter seldom read the book.'

b. Anna **hiányos-an** írta   meg/*meg-írta a   feladatot.
Anna defective-ly wrote.DEF PFX   the assignment
'Anna wrote the assignment with deficiencies.'

Another class qualifies verb phrases and has no contrasting alternatives, which is why they cannot be focussed.

(483) a. Péter teljes-en   el-olvasta/*olvasta el a   könyvet.
Peter complete-ly PFX-read.DEF   the book.ACC
'Peter read the book completely.'

b. Anna kereken   meg-mondta/*mondta meg az   igazat.
Anna forthright PFX-said.DEF   the truth.ACC
'Anna told the truth forthrightly.'

The rest of the adverbials can be freely focussed.

(484) a. Péter tegnap   el-olvasta   a   könyvet.
Peter yesterday PFX-read.DEF the book.ACC
'Peter read the book yesterday.'

b. Péter **tegnap** olvasta el a könyvet.
'It's yesterday that Peter read the book.'

(485) a. Anna otthon   meg-írta   a   feladatot.
Anna at-home PFX-wrote.DEF the assignment.
'Anna wrote the assignment at home.'

b. Anna **otthon** írta meg a feladatot.
'It's at home that Anna wrote the assignment.'

1.11.2.2.2.1. Constituents of the main clause   Any constituent of the main clause can be focussed, with the exception of the items listed above, such as auxiliaries, a small set of finite verbs, and certain adverbials. Focussable constituents include even finite clauses, provided they are headless (or free) relative clauses, which count as noun or adpositional phrases; in other words, they are not focussed as clauses.

(486) a. Csak [**aki tud   angolul**] olvasta   a   könyvet.
       only who speaks English   read.DEF the book.ACC
       'Only those who speak English have read the book.'

   b. Péter nem [**amikor megérkezett**] aludt el.
      Peter not when   arrived.3SG slept PFX
      'Peter didn't fall asleep when he arrived (he fell asleep at some other time).'

Evidence for the claim that headless relatives are not focussed as clauses comes from the impossibility of focussing any other type of clause, whether a *that*-clause or a relative clause.

(487) a. *Anna [**hogy Péter beteg volt**] olvasta.
       Anna   that   Peter sick   was   read.DEF
       'What Anna read was that Peter had been sick.'

   b. *Csak [**az a fiú, aki tud   angolul**] olvasta   a   könyvet.
      only   that boy who speaks English   read.DEF the book.ACC
      'Only the boy that speaks English has read the book.'

As regards nonfinite complement clauses, infinitival clauses cannot be focussed as such, although their constituents can become focussed in the main clause, as exemplified directly below. Adjunct participial (converb) clauses can sometimes be emphatic.

(488)   Péter [**a székben ülve**]   aludt el.
         Peter the chair-INE sit-SCVB slept PFX
         'It's (while) sitting in the chair that Peter fell asleep.'

1.11.2.2.2.2. Constituents of the subordinate clause   Constituents of finite adjunct clauses can be emphatic without further ado, provided they are placed into the preverbal focus position inside their own clause.

(489) a. Mivel Péter meg-érkezett, Anna nem olvasott tovább.
       since Peter PFX-arrived Anna not read   further
       'Since Peter had arrived, Anna didn't continue reading.'

b.   Mivel **Péter** érkezett meg, Anna nem olvasott tovább.
'Since it was Peter that arrived, Anna didn't continue reading.'

If some constituent of the finite complement clause of the verbal predicate of the main clause is emphatic, the clause itself must also be focussed, as indicated by the position its pronominal expletive marker occupies, or it is possible to move the emphatic constituent into the main clause.

(490) a.   Anna **az-t**   akarta,   hogy Péter **a   könyvet**
Anna it-ACC wanted.DEF that   Peter the book.ACC

olvassa.
read.SUBJ.DEF.3SG
'It's the book that Anna wanted Peter to read.'

b.   Anna **a könyvet** akarta, hogy Péter olvassa.
'It's the book that Anna wanted Peter to read.'

If the subject of the clause is extracted from an object clause, it receives accusative case in the main clause. (Note that some speakers accept extraction from subjunctive clauses better than from indicative ones; others do not accept extraction from clauses at all.)

(491) a.   Anna **az-t** akarta, hogy **Péter** olvassa a könyvet.
'It's Peter that Anna wanted to read the book.'

b.   Anna **Péter-t** akarta, hogy olvassa a könyvet.
'It's Peter that Anna wanted to read the book.'

If the clause is an adjunct or complement to a nonverbal predicate, the emphatic element is moved into focus position in its own clause and the clause itself is marked as focussed in the main clause by a pronominal expletive in focus position there.

(492) a.   Anna **azzal** írta   meg a   levelet,   amit   **Péter** adott
Anna it.INS wrote PFX the letter.ACC which.ACC Peter gave

neki.
to.her
'Anna wrote the letter with what **Peter** had given her.'

b.   Anna **arra**   volt büszke, hogy Péter **a   könyvet**   olvassa.
Anna it.SUB was proud   that   Peter the book.ACC reads.DEF
'Anna was proud of the fact that it was the book that Peter was reading.'

Focussed items can move into a focus position inside their own infinitival clause or they can move out from infinitival complement clauses.

(493) a.   Fontos   volt Péter-nek **a   könyvet**   olvas-ni.
            important was Peter-DAT the book.ACC read-INF
            'It was important for Peter to read **the book**.'

      b.   **A könyvet** volt fontos Péter-nek olvas-ni.
            'It's the book that it was important for Peter to read.'

If there is a focussed item in a participial clause embedded in a noun phrase, the entire noun phrase is moved into the main clause focus position.

(494)   Anna [a [**könyvet** olvas-ó]   személyeket] kereste.
            Anna the book.ACC read-APRT persons.ACC sought.DEF
            'Anna was looking for persons reading **books**.'

If the emphatic element is in an adjunct participial (converb) clause, it is only acceptable if the clause can itself be focussed.

(495)   Péter csak [**a könyvet**   olvasva   el] tudta   megírni
            Peter only the book.ACC read.SCVB PFX could.DEF write

           a   levelet
           the letter.ACC
           'Peter could write the letter only having read the book.'

1.11.2.2.2.3. Noun phrase   Generally, if any constituent of a noun phrase is emphatic, the whole noun phrase has to move into the focus position of its clause, as has been illustrated above for adjectives or nonfinite participial clauses. The case is the same with demonstratives or numerals.

If, however, either the possessor NP or the possessed nominal is emphasized, either one or the other can be independently focussed, since possessor NPs can be extracted from their noun phrases.

(496) a.   Anna [**Péter-nek** a   könyv-é-t]   olvasta   el.
            Anna Peter-DAT the book-POSS-ACC read.DEF PFX
            'It's **Peter's** book that Anna has read.'

      b.   Anna **Péter-nek** olvasta el [a könyv-é-t]
            'It's **Peter's** book that Anna has read.'

(497) a.   Anna [Péter-nek a **könyv-é-t**]
            'It's Peter's **book** that Anna has read.'

      b.   Anna [**a könyv-é-t**] olvasta el Péter-nek.
            'It's Peter's **book** that Anna has read.'

Constituents of noun phrases can also be emphasized and extracted in appositive constructions, which bear multiple case-marking.

(498) a.   Anna **könyv-et**   olvasott négy-et.
        Anna book-ACC read   four-ACC
        'It's books that Anna has read four of.'

    b.   Könyv-et Anna **négy-et** olvasott.
        'As for books, Anna has read four of them.'

1.11.2.2.2.4. Coordinate construction   While any coordinate constructions can be focussed, no constituent can be moved out of the construction, though it is possible for one to receive emphasis independently of the others.

(499) a.   **Anna és   Péter** olvasta   el   a   könyvet.
        Anna and Peter read.DEF PFX the book.ACC
        'It's Anna and Peter that have read the book.'

    b.   *****Anna** olvasta el [és Péter] a könyvet.

    c.   Nem [Anna és   **Péter**] olvasta   el   a   könyvet   (hanem
        not   Anna and Peter   read.DEF PFX the book.ACC but

        Anna és   Pál).
        Anna and Paul
        'It's not Anna and Peter (but Anna and Paul) that have read the book.'

1.11.2.2.2.5. Multiple emphasis   If more than one item bears focus, one of them must move into the preverbal focus position, and the other(s) is/ are placed behind the inflected verb.

(500)   **Anna** olvasta   el   **a   könyvet**   (**Péter** pedig   **a**
        Anna read.DEF PFX the book.ACC Peter   in-turn the

        cikket).
        article.ACC
        '**Anna** has read **the book** (and **Peter _ the article**).'

In principle any independently focussable constituent can participate in a multiply emphasized construction, but actually only phrasal (and no clausal) constituents can occupy the preverbal position.

1.11.2.2.3. Properties of movement

As was seen in the examples cited, the movement of a constituent into the preverbal focus position leaves behind no visible trace in any of the cases studied.

1.12. TOPIC

Hungarian is often claimed to be a "topic-prominent" language (cf., e.g., É. Kiss 1987, 1994), which is to be understood as claiming that, in contrast to English-type languages, in which the primary predication relation is between the subject and the predicate, in Hungarian it holds between the topic and the predicate. Below we will discuss the movement of nonfocussed or nonquantified elements into initial positions, and will show whether or not the phrases affected qualify for topichood. Note that, partly in order to ascertain what is in topic position and partly to correctly represent topic–focus structure, foci will be marked in the examples (by bold type as usual).

1.12.1. Means to indicate the topic

1.12.1.1. Movement to topic position

A nonquantified and nonfocussed preverbal item is a/the topic in the Hungarian sentence. As was seen above in 1.11, the position directly in front of the inflected verb (stem) is reserved for focus (or emphasis). There is also a "quantifier-field" in front of the focus slot: (phrases containing) universal quantifiers (= UQ) are placed to the left of the optional focus, while there is a further position to the left of the optional quantifiers for *is*- 'even, also' phrases (cf. Kenesei 1986, Brody 1990). Thus the full array of major constituents in a Hungarian sentence is as follows.

(501)　　*Topic(s)* Is-*phrase*　　　　　　　UQ-*Phrases Focus*
　　　　　Anna　még　a　könyvet　is　mindig　**Péter-nek**
　　　　　Anna　even　the book.ACC CL always　Peter-DAT

　　　　　Verb　...
　　　　　olvasta fel　először.
　　　　　read　out first
　　　　　'Anna always read out even the book to Peter first.'

There can be more than one topicalized phrase, and the only further condition topics have to observe is that they must in general be specific: nonspecific items can be foci or can be placed postverbally, but they usually cannot occur in the initial topic position.

(502) a.　*Egy könyv-et　**Anna** olvasott el.
　　　　　a　book-ACC Anna read　PFX
　　　　　'As for a book, **Anna** has read it.'

　　b.　A könyvet **Anna** olvasta el.
　　　　　'As for the book, it's Anna that's read it.'

←————————————Topics————————————→Focus

(503)   Anna a   könyvet   tegnap   a   szobában **egyedül**
         Anna the book.ACC yesterday the room.ILL alone

olvasta.
read.DEF
'Yesterday in the room Anna was reading the book alone.'

1.12.1.2. Left-dislocation

The only other means by which leftward movement can be carried out is
called left-dislocation. It differs from topic-fronting in that it leaves
behind a coreferential pronominal or, less frequently, adverbial, which
carries the same case as the left-dislocated item.

(504) a.   Anna, az olvasta   a   könyv-et.
           Anna it read.DEF.3SG the book-ACC
           'As for Anna, she's read the book.'

      b.   A   könyv-et, az-t   Anna olvasta.
           the book-ACC it-ACC Anna read.DEF
           'As for the book, Anna has read it.'

      c.   Péter-nek, an-nak Anna olvasta   fel a   könyv-et.
           Peter-DAT it-DAT Anna read.DEF.3SG out the book.ACC
           'As for Peter, it was Anna that read out the book to him.'

      d.   A   szobá-ban, ott   Anna olvas.
           the room-ILL   there Anna reads
           'As for the room, Anna is reading there.'

Note that for some dialects it is possible to refer back to left-dislocated
items denoting human beings by means of personal pronouns. Thus in
examples (a) and (c) above it is possible to use ő 's/he' and neki 'to him/
her' for az and an-nak, respectively.

While there can be several items moved into initial position through
simple topic movement, no more than one can be left-dislocated, and,
moreover, an item apparently left-dislocated can be preceded by another
one that was not, indicating that the term "left-dislocation" may very well
be a misnomer.

(505) a.   *Anna a   könyvet, ő/az azt   a   szobá-ban olvasta.
            Anna the book.ACC she it.ACC the room-ILL read

      b.   Anna a könyvet, az-t a szobá-ban olvasta.
           'The book, Anna read it in the room.'

Left-dislocation is frequently interpreted as expressing some kind of
contrast between the element involved and some other item, explicit or

implicit. Thus the last example above can be construed also as follows: 'As for the book, Anna read it in the room, but there is/may be some other item that she read at some place other than the room.'

Nevertheless, it cannot be claimed either that nonspecific items are always left-dislocated and therefore contrasted, or that nonfocussed but contrasted items must be left-dislocated, since they can be placed to the right of specific NPs, which are unquestionable topics.

(506)   Anna könyv-et   nem olvas (de novellá-t   igen).
          Anna book-ACC not reads but short-story-ACC yes
          'Anna doesn't read books.'
          'Anna doesn't read books, but she does read short stories.'

It is often the case that the constituent to be interpreted as contrasted carries a specific rising pitch and is followed by a short pause. In this case the coreferential pronominal does not occur.

1.12.2. Elements topicalized

1.12.2.1.1. Noun phrase

As was illustrated above, specific noun phrases can be topicalized with ease, but nonspecific items can also be placed into positions available for topics.

1.12.2.1.2. Adjective

Both predicative adjectives and adjectives in subject or object complement position can be topicalized by the following devices. Both types can be placed in the usual initial position, but the former can also be left-dislocated (and marked by the dative case) and reduplicated inside the clause. Note that all of these are best illustrated in focussed sentences, and that the sense translations are incapable of providing the topicalized readings for the adjectives.

(507) a.   Érdekes   **a könyv** volt.
          interesting the book   was
          'It's the book that was interesting.'

     b.   Érdekes-nek   **a könyv** volt érdekes.
          interesting-DAT
          'It's the book that was interesting.'

(508) a.   Érdekes-nek   **Anna** tartotta   a   könyv-et.
          interesting-DAT Anna considered.DEF the book-ACC
          'It's Anna that considered the book interesting.'

  b.   *Érdekes-nek **Anna** tartotta érdekes-nek a könyv-et.

1.12.2.1.3. Verb

Unprefixed verbs can be topicalized by left-dislocating them in an infini-
tival form and retaining their inflected forms inside the clause. Prefixed
verbs are topicalized in two ways: in the case of prefixes used in their
literal (locative, etc.) meanings the prefix can occur left of the inflected
verb and separated from it, while in the case of prefixed verbs in general,
the entire complex verb can undergo the operation – an option for verbs
with prefixes in literal meanings, but an obligation for those whose
prefixes are not used in the literal sense.

(509) a.   Olvas-ni **Anna** olvas-t-a   a   könyvet.
           read-INF Anna read-PAST-DEF.3SG the book.ACC
           'As for reading (it), it's Anna that's read the book.'

  b.   Fel **Anna** ment a   lépcső-n.
       up Anna went the stairs-SUP
       ca. 'Up Anna went the stairs.'

  c.   Fel-men-ni **Anna** ment fel a lépcső-n.
       up-go-INF
       ca. 'Up Anna went the stairs.'

(510) a.   *Fel **Anna** olvasta   a   könyvet.
           up   Anna read.DEF the book.ACC

  b.   Fel-olvas-ni **Anna** olvasta   fel a   könyvet.
       up-read-INF Anna read.DEF.3SG PFX the book.ACC
       'As for reading (it) out, it's Anna that's read the book out.'

Reduced complements (or verbal modifiers) of verbs can also be topical-
ized and interpreted as topicalizing the entire complex verb.

(511) a.   Tegnap   könyvet   **Anna** olvasott a   szobában.
           yesterday book.ACC Anna read   the room.ILL
           ca. 'As for book-reading, it's Anna that did so in the room
           yesterday.'

  b.   Fal-ra   **Péter** akasztotta a   képet.
       wall-SUB Peter hung.DEF the picture.ACC
       ca. 'As for onto-wall-hanging, it's Peter that hung the picture on
       some wall.'

1.12.2.1.4. Adverbial

Time and place adverbials that make specific reference are fully accept-
able as topics.

(512) a.   1986-ban Anna sok   könyvet   olvasott.
           1986-INE Anna many book.ACC read
           'In 1986, Anna read many books.'

      b.   A   szobá-ban Anna sok   könyvet   olvasott.
           the room-INE Anna many book.ACC read
           'In the room, Anna read many books.'

Adverbials of frequency, manner, etc., are nonspecific and can occur in
initial positions only if they carry a sense of contrast. This is shown by
the fact that nonfocussable (i.e., noncontrastable) adverbials cannot be
preposed.

(513) a.   Gyors-an **Anna** olvasta   el   a   könyvet.
           fast-ADV Anna read.DEF PFX the book.ACC
           'Anna was the one that read the book fast (. . . but there may
           have been someone else who read it slowly).'

      b.   *Kereken   Anna mondta   meg az igazat.
           forthright Anna said.DEF PFX the truth.ACC

1.12.2.2.1. Constituents of the main clause

In addition to the elements discussed so far, complement clauses can also
be topicalized, whether by simple movement or left-dislocation. In the
former case (a) the clause moves together with its pronominal expletive,
while in the latter there is always a coreferential – viz., (b) personal or (c)
nonpersonal – pronominal in the main clause.

(514) a.   Ar-ról, hogy Péter beteg volt, Anna nem olvasott.
           it-DEL that Peter sick   was Anna not   read
           'Anna didn't read about Peter's having been sick.'

      b.   Hogy Péter beteg volt, Anna nem olvasott ról-a.
           ca. 'That Peter had been sick, Anna didn't read about it.'

      c.   Hogy Péter beteg volt, ar-ról Anna nem olvasott.
           ca. 'That Peter had been sick, Anna didn't read about it.'

   Finite adjunct clauses can also be interpreted as topicalized if the pro-
nominal expletive in construction with them occupies a topic position in
the main clause, whether or not the clause itself is adjacent to it.

(515) a.   Az-után, hogy Péter megérkezett, Anna nem olvasott.
           it-after   that   Peter arrived   Anna not   read
           'Anna wasn't reading after Peter had arrived.'

     b.   Az-után Anna nem olvasott, hogy Péter megérkezett.
          'Anna wasn't reading after Peter had arrived.'

   The question of topicalization probably does not arise in the case of adjunct clauses that do not have a pronominal expletive in the main clause, since they can be placed only in the "periphery" of the main clause, that is, in initial (whether first or second) or final positions.

(516) a.   Mivel Péter megérkezett, Anna nem olvasott tovább.
           since Peter arrived   Anna not   read   further
           'Since Peter had arrived, Anna didn't continue reading.'

     b.   Anna, mivel Péter megérkezett, nem olvasott tovább.
          'Since Peter had arrived, Anna didn't continue reading.'

     c.   Anna nem olvasott tovább, mivel Péter megérkezett.
          'Since Peter had arrived, Anna didn't continue reading.'

   It is difficult to say whether nonfinite complement clauses can be topicalized. First, the constituents of infinitival clauses often do not hold together, that is, they undergo some kind of clause union with the main clause (cf. 1.1.2.2.6.8), and even if they do it is questionable whether they function as topic(s). Second, even though the constituents of simple converb (adverbial participial) clauses can be moved together into initial positions, it is equally dubious whether they serve as topics.

(517) a.   [Péter-nek a   könyvet   olvas-ni] fontos   volt.
           Peter-DAT the book.ACC read-INF important was
           'For Peter to read the book was important.'

     b.   [A szék-ben ül-ve]   Péter el-aludt.
          the chair-INE sit-SCVB Peter PFX-slept
          'Sitting in the chair, Peter fell asleep.'

   It is thus necessary to distinguish initial positions from topics: more types of constituents can occur in initial positions than can be said to function as topics.

1.12.2.2.2. Constituents of the subordinate clause

Both simple topicalization and left-dislocation are possible in complement clauses, but left-dislocation is not acceptable inside adjunct (relative, adverbial, etc.) clauses.

(518) a. Péter azt   mondta, hogy Anna, az **olvasta**   a
         Peter it.ACC said.DEF that   Anna she read.DEF the
         könyv-et.
         book.ACC
         'Peter said that Anna, she'd read the book.'

     b. *?Péter aludt, amikor Anna, az olvasta a könyv-et.
         Peter   slept   when
         'Peter was sleeping when Anna, she was reading the book.'

The issue of topicalization within nonfinite clauses does not arise because, apart from infinitival clauses, all subtypes are verb-final, which makes the distinction between topics and (nonemphatic) nontopics impossible.

However, constituents of subordinate clauses can be extracted and topicalized in the main clause. Due to the clause union phenomenon observed in infinitival complement clauses, discounting the infinitive itself, any appropriate element can undergo such a process.

(519) a. A könyvet   **Anna** akarja   fel-olvas-ni   Péter-nek a
         the book.ACC Anna wants.DEF PFX-read-INF Peter-DAT the

         kert-ben.
         garden-INE
         'The book, Anna wants to read out to Peter in the garden.'

     b. A kert-ben **Anna** akarja fel-olvas-ni Péter-nek a könyvet.
         'In the garden, Anna wants to read the book out to Peter.'

Constituents of finite complement subordinate clauses can be moved out into main clause topic positions with or without retaining the pronominal expletive marking the syntactic position of the clause. Observe that, somewhat similarly to focus raising, if the subject is moved into main clause topic position, its nominative can change into accusative; in fact the sentence with the accusative marked subject is significantly better than the one with the nominative marked subject, though for a number of speakers subject raising into a higher topic as such is unacceptable.

(520) a. A könyv-et   Anna az-t   mondta, hogy fel-olvassa
         the book-ACC Anna it-ACC said.DEF that   PFX-reads

         Péter-nek.
         Peter-DAT
         'The book, Anna said that she would read it to Peter.'

     b. A könyv-et **Anna** mondta, hogy fel-olvassa Péter-nek.
         'The book, Anna said that she would read it to Peter.'

(521) a. *?Péter   **Anna** mondta, hogy majd fel-olvassa a
         Peter.NOM Anna said.DEF that then PFX-reads the

         könyv-et.
         book-ACC
         '(As for) Peter, Anna said he would then read out the book.'

     b. Péter-t   **Anna** mondta, hogy majd fel-olvassa a könyv-et.
         Peter-ACC
         '(As for) Peter, Anna said he would then read out the book.'

Topic movement is not possible out of adjunct clauses, whether finite or not.

1.12.2.2.3. Constituents of noun phrases

In general, entire noun phrases are topicalized, whether by simple topicalization or left-dislocation. However, possessive NPs can be broken up in ways illustrated above, and either the possessor NP or the possessed nominal, or both, can become topics.

(522) a. Péter **tegnap**   olvasta [Anná-nak a   könyv-é-t]
         Peter yesterday read   Anna-DAT the book-POSS-ACC
         'Peter read Anna's book yesterday.'

     b. [Anná-nak a könyv-é-t] Péter **tegnap** olvasta
         'As for Anna's book, Peter read it yesterday.'

     c. [Anná-nak] Péter **tegnap** olvasta [a könyv-é-t]
         'As for Anna, Peter read her book yesterday.'

     d. [A könyv-é-t] Péter **tegnap** olvasta [Anná-nak].
         ca. 'As for Anna's *book*, Peter read it yesterday.'

     e. [Anná-nak] Péter [a könyv-é-t] **tegnap** olvasta.
         ca. 'As for Anna's book, Peter read it yesterday.'

Note that the last example differs in that it indicates a sense of contrast between Anna's book and some other work by her.

   As was illustrated in the section on emphasis, if one element in an appositive construction is focussed, the other can be topicalized, cf. 1.11.2.2.2.3.

1.12.2.2.4. Constituents of coordinate construction

No individual constituent of a coordinate construction can be topicalized independently of the other(s); in other words, extraction from coordinate constructions is not possible.

1.12.2.2.5. More than one constituent

The process of simple topicalization can be used to move more than one constituent into initial position, and if they are all specific they can be interpreted as topics (cf. 1.12.1.1). That includes even finite subordinate clauses with or without their demonstrative/expletive.

(523)   Anna (az-t),   hogy Péter beteg volt, nem olvasta.
           Anna it-ACC that   Peter sick   was not   read.DEF
           '(The fact) that Peter was sick, Anna hasn't read.'

In other than nominative and accusative case the pronominal cannot be dropped, but can be placed postverbally even if the clause is in the pre-verbal topic position.

(524) a.   Anna ar-ról, hogy Péter beteg volt, nem olvasott.
           Anna it-DEL that   Peter sick   was not   read
           ca. 'That Peter was sick, Anna hasn't read about it.'

      b.   Anna, hogy Péter beteg volt, ar-ról nem olvasott.
           ca. 'That Peter was sick, Anna hasn't read about it.'

      c.   Hogy Péter beteg volt, Anna nem olvasott ar-ról.
           ca. 'That Peter was sick, Anna hasn't read about it.'

1.12.2.3. Properties of movement

As was outlined above, the two basic versions of topicalization, simple movement and left-dislocation, differ in that the latter, but not the former, affects a single constituent only and leaves a coreferential pronominal inside the clause. While simple topicalization can move essentially any constituent, left-dislocation is inapplicable to adverbials, with the exception of place adverbials, and, in a more limited manner, time adverbials.

This distribution of topicalization processes is, however, cross–classified by the type of contrastive interpretation mentioned repeatedly above, since nonfocussed contrasted phrases are also called left-dislocated in the literature (cf. É. Kiss 1987, 1994). First of all, such a reading arises only if the sentence carries some kind of emphasis, whether contradictory or contrastive. (Putative topics are in italics.)

(525) a.   *neutral*
           Péter tegnap   olvasta a   könyv-et.
           Peter yesterday read   the book-ACC
           'Yesterday Peter was reading the book.'

b. *emphatic*
Péter tegnap nem olvasta a könyv-et.
'Yesterday Peter was not reading the book.'

While the first sentence has only one reading, the second has at least three: (i) the one given above, with no contrast understood; (ii) 'he wasn't reading the book yesterday, but someone else was'; (iii) 'yesterday he wasn't reading the book, but at some other time he was.' The contrast readings can be made more prominent by assigning rising pitch to the element in question, with a pause separating it from the rest of the sentence, which has falling intonation.

The contrast reading is associated with left-dislocation also because it occurs only in emphatic contexts, and left-dislocation is mostly possible under such a condition, too.

(526) a. *neutral*
*?A könyv-et, az-t Péter olvasta a
the book-ACC it-ACC Peter yesterday read.DEF
szobá–ban.
the room-INE

b. *emphatic*
A könyv-et, az-t **Péter** olvasta a szobá-ban.
'As for the book, it was Peter that was reading it in the room
(. . . but there is/may be some other item that someone else was reading).'

Thus, whereas left-dislocated phrases are usually interpreted as contrasted, not all (nonfocussed) contrasted phrases are left-dislocated. Moreover, as was also mentioned above, so-called left-dislocated phrases do not necessarily occur in an absolute initial position.

In sum, both simple movement and, though to a lesser extent, left–dislocation are processes of topic formation. For further analyses of movement, see 1.14.

1.12.3. The optionality/obligatoriness of topicalization

Topicalization is an optional process: there are no constituents that are unacceptable if not topicalized.

1.13. HEAVY SHIFT

1.13.1. Elements affected by Heavy Shift

Since the order of constituents in the sentence is not fixed according to grammatical functions, it is not in these terms that Heavy Shift can be studied. Heavy Shift affects two types of constituents: finite subordinate clauses and adverbial phrases in NPs, which move obligatorily out of the focus position and optionally out of any other position.

1.13.2. Structures subject to Heavy Shift

1.13.2.1. Finite subordinate clauses

The preverbal focus position can host a single constituent, but it cannot accommodate a finite subordinate clause (with the exception of headless or free relative clauses). Since it is possible for the head of the clause to be a pronominal expletive or to contain one, when the clause is removed its focus function remains recoverable.

(527) a. *Anna [**az-t, hogy Péter beteg volt**] olvasta   tegnap.
Anna it-ACC that   Peter sick   was read.DEF yesterday

b. Anna **az-t** olvasta tegnap, hogy Péter beteg volt.
ca. 'What Anna read yesterday was that Peter had been sick.'

(528) a. *Péter [**ar-ról   a   fiú-ról,   aki beteg volt**] olvasott.
Peter   that-DEL the boy-DEL who sick   was read

b. Péter **ar-ról a fiú-ról** olvasott, aki beteg volt.
'It's the boy who'd been sick that Peter read about.'

   Movement out of other syntactic positions is basically optional. Even clauses are not forced to move away from their heads in topic positions, though when placed postverbally the structure is most acceptable if the clause occupies a final position.

(529) a. Az-t, hogy Péter beteg volt, **Anna** olvasta tegnap.
'(The fact) that Peter had been sick, **Anna** read yesterday.'

b. Azt **Anna** olvasta tegnap, hogy Péter beteg volt.
'(The fact) that Peter had been sick, **Anna** read yesterday.'

(530) a. ?**Anna** olvasta azt, hogy Péter beteg volt, tegnap.
'**Anna** read yesterday that Peter had been sick.'

b. **Anna** olvasta azt tegnap, hogy Péter beteg volt.
'**Anna** read yesterday that Peter had been sick.'

1.13.2.2. Adverbials in NPs

As was shown in 1.2.5.2.7, subject and object NPs can contain postnominal adverbial phrases constructed of case-marked or postpositional NPs. They, too, are disallowed in focus positions; thus they have to move out.

(531) a. Két könyv-et   Ibsen-ről   Anna érdekes-nek   talált.
two book-ACC Ibsen-DEL Anna interesting-DAT found
'Anna found two books about Ibsen interesting.'

     b. *[**Két könyv-et Ibsen-ről**] talált Anna érdekes-nek.

     c. [**Két** könyv-et] talált Ibsen-ről Anna érdekes-nek.
'It's **two** books about Ibsen that Anna found interesting.'

As regards other positions, movement of the adverbial phrase is in principle optional, though since the shifted phrase is not heavy the resulting structure is more awkward than the one with an adjacent adverbial. Below, topic is illustrated.

(532)   Ibsen-ről Anna **két** könyv-et talált érdekesnek.
'Anna found **two** books about Ibsen interesting.'

1.13.3. The target position of Heavy Shift

As illustrated, Heavy Shift moves finite clauses to the right edge of the clause in question, but adverbials may end up in nonfinal postverbal positions.

1.13.4. More than one phrase moved

Since only movement out of focus is obligatory, it is not necessary for two clauses to undergo Heavy Shift within the same sentence. However, it is possible to move two finite subordinate clauses within the same main clause. Below we will index the heads and the clauses belonging to them to help identify them. The first pair of sentences illustrates the ordering variations with clauses inside their original constituents.

(533) a. [Az a férfi, aki   az asztal-nál áll]$_1$ tudja [azt,   hogy
that man who the table-ADE stands knows it.ACC that

        ki   érkezett]$_2$
who came
'The man standing by the table knows who had come.'

     b. [Azt, hogy ki érkezett]$_2$ tudja [az a férfi, aki az asztal-nál áll]$_1$
'The man standing by the table knows who had come.'

Not all orders are acceptable if the clauses are shifted to final positions. Whether or not there is focus in the sentence, two ordering possibilities are unacceptable. (The meanings are essentially the same as above. Coindexing associates heads and clauses.)

(534) a. *[Az a férfi]₁ **azt₂** tudja [hogy ki érkezett]₂ [aki az asztalnál áll]₁

b. *[Az a férfi]₁ **azt₂** tudja [aki az asztalnál áll]₁ [hogy ki érkezett]₂

c. Azt₂ [**az a férfi**]₁ tudja [hogy ki érkezett]₂ [aki az asztalnál áll]₁
    'It's the man standing by the table that knows who had come.'

d. Azt₂ [**az a férfi**]₁ tudja [aki az asztalnál áll]₁ [hogy ki érkezett]₂
    'It's the man standing by the table that knows who had come.'

It is thus immaterial which clause is in which final position; what matters is that in the competition between the two heads for the single focus position, the head of the relative clause wins out. But note that the head of the object complement clause is not excluded from the focus position; for that to be possible, the relative clause must not be shifted but has to stay adjacent to its head.

(535) [Az a férfi, aki az asztalnál áll]₁ **azt₂** tudja [hogy ki érkezett]₂
       ca. 'What the man standing by the table knows is who had come.'

1.13.5. Heavy Shift with elements next to complementizers

As illustrated above, Heavy Shift is possible from preverbal positions, including the one next to the complementizer (which, incidentally, is not necessarily a subject position in Hungarian).

1.14. OTHER MOVEMENT PROCESSES

1.14.1. Scrambling

As has been claimed throughout, constituent order is fairly free in Hungarian. This is a result of optional focussing and topicalization, and furthermore, of the high degree of freedom of constituents within a nonneutral sentence. Once some element is focussed, the relatively rigid order of the neutral sentence is "liberated" and items can move around with no difficulty.

(536) a. *neutral*
          Anna tegnap   olvasta   a   könyvet   a   szobában.
          Anna yesterday read.DEF the book.ACC the room.INE
          'Anna was reading the book in the room yesterday.'

   b.   Anna tegnap **a szobában** olvasta a könyvet.
       'It's in the room that Anna was reading the book yesterday.'

   c.   **A szobában** olvasta a könyvet Anna tegnap.
       'It's in the room that Anna was reading the book yesterday.'

   d.   **A szobában** olvasta Anna a könyvet tegnap.
       'It's in the room that Anna was reading the book yesterday.'

   e.   **A szobában** olvasta tegnap a könyvet Anna.
       'It's in the room that Anna was reading the book yesterday.'

In other words, in addition to optional topicalization, there is also an optional process of "scrambling" to the right of the inflected verb.

1.14.2. Short verb and verbal prefix movement

In addition to topic and focus (or in general, quantifier) movement, there is a curious type of movement, which affects either simple infinitives or prefixes and reduced complements of complex infinitives that are complements to a class of main verbs, called "prefix-raising" in 1.1.2.2.6.8. They require in neutral sentences that the lower prefix – or, in its absence, the verb itself – be placed in front of them.

(537) a.   Anna le   fog szalad-ni Péter-hez.
          Anna down will run-INF Peter.ALL
          'Anna will run down to Peter.'

      b.   Péter könyv-et   akar   olvas-ni.
          Peter book-ACC wants read-INF
          'Peter wants to read books.'

      c.   Anna úsz-ni   akar.
          Anna swim-INF wants
          'Anna wants to swim.'

Moreover, these elements can move further onto a higher clause if its predicate is also "prefix-raising". In case either the higher or the lower main verb is not "prefix-raising", the prefix (or the reduced complement) must stay in its original clause. Below *igyekszik* 'strive' is not a "prefix-raising" verb.

(538) a.   Anna igyekszik el-olvas-ni   a   könyv-et.
          Anna strives   PFX-read-INF the book-ACC
          'Anna strives to read the book.'

      b.   *Anna el igyekszik olvas-ni a könyv-et.

(539) a.   Anna igyekez-ni fog el-olvasni   a   könyv-et.
               Anna strive-INF will PFX-read-INF the book-ACC
               'Anna will strive to read the book.'

      b.   *Anna el fog-ja igyekez-ni olvas-ni a könyv-et.

      c.   Anna el   fog-ja   akar-ni   olvas-ni   a   könyv-et.
             Anna PFX will-DEF want-INF read-INF the book-ACC
             'Anna will want to read the book.'

For more analysis, see Farkas and Sadock (1989) and Szabolsci (1996).

1.14.3. Focus left-dislocation

Another movement not discussed so far is a version of left-dislocation in which the anaphoric element associated with the left-dislocated item is in focus, rather than in topic, as was shown in 1.12. In this case too, both the left-dislocated phrase and the pronominal in focus bear the same case and, moreover, they have an identical, falling, pitch-accent in indicative clauses. Just as topic left-dislocation, this subtype does not have to occur in absolute initial position.

(540) a.   **A könyv-et**, Anna **az-t**   olvasta   a   szobában
              the book-ACC Anna it-ACC read.DEF the room-INE

              tegnap.
              yesterday
              'It's the book that Anna was reading in the room yesterday.'

      b.   Tegnap **a könyv-et, azt** olvasta Anna a szobában.
             'It's the book that Anna was reading in the room yesterday.'

1.15. MINOR SENTENCE TYPES

Sentences with no finite predicate are possible under certain conditions. In one type the initial locative predicate can do without the otherwise obligatory copula, cf. 1.2.1.1.3.

(541) a.   Előtt-e   az élet.
             before-3SG the life
             'Life is before him/her.'

      b.   Az élet előtt-e *(van).
                     is

   Another type is a short command comprising a directional place adverbial, the equivalent of which is found in a number of other languages.

(542) a.   Előre   a   bástyá-ra!
           forward the bastion-SUB
           'Forward to the bastion!'

      b.   Ki az árulók-kal!
           out the traitors-INS
           'Out with the traitors!'

One more type of these noncopular sentences is questions.

(543) a.   Mi-nek   a   sok   kiabálás?
           what-DAT the much yelling
           'What's all the yelling for?'

      b.   Merre   a   kijárat?
           whither the exit
           'Where's the exit?'

Note that the respective answers must contain the copula, unless they fall
under the option illustrated in (541).

1.16. OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR WORDCLASSES

Since Hungarian is a highly agglutinative language, major wordclasses
can in principle be distinguished by the affixal morphemes they can
cooccur with.

1.16.1. Noun

Nouns are inflected for case and number; that is not, however, sufficient to
distinguish them from adjectives and numerals, which, for reasons
touched upon in 1.2.5.1, can be the rightmost constituents in a noun
phrase, thus inflected in identical ways to nouns.

(544) a.   Anna négy alacsony férfi-t   győzött le.
           Anna four short   man-ACC beat   PFX
           'Anna beat four short men.'

      b.   Anna négy alacsony-at győzött le.
           'Anna beat four short ones.'

      c.   Anna négy-et győzött le.
           'Anna beat four ones.'

However, neither numerals nor adjectives can occur in the position of the
possessed nominal in possessive noun phrases.

(545) a.   Anna három érdekes   könyv-e
           Anna three   interesting book-POSS
           'Anna's three interesting books'

   b.   *Anna (három) érdekes-e

   c.   *Anna hárm-a/három-ja

Other criteria are negative, as it were: adjectives and/or numerals can take various inflectional endings which are impossible for nouns. These will be illustrated below.

1.16.2. Pronoun

All pronouns substitute for entire noun phrases; further properties are given in the subsections below.

1.16.2.1. Personal pronouns

If the personal pronoun is in subject position, the finite predicate has to agree with it. First person singular verb-forms show agreement with second person objects, as well.

(546) a.   én lát-ok   b. én lát-lak   téged/titeket
           I   see-1SG   I   see-1SG.2OB you.SG/PL.ACC

Personal pronouns are inflected by being affixed to case affixes as bases.

(547) a.   könyv-vel   b. vel-e   c. vel–em
           book-INS   INS-3SG   INS-1SG
           'with book'   'with him/her' 'with me'

   d.   Péter-nek   e. nek-i   f. nek-em
        Peter-DAT   DAT-3SG   DAT-1SG
        'to Peter'   'to him'   'to me'

1.16.2.2. Reflexive pronouns

The apparent root *mag-* is inflected for number and person, and the resulting form for case. Reflexive pronouns do not occur in subject position (see 1.5.1.4).

1.16.2.3. Demonstrative pronouns

They occur in place of noun phrases as well as in an initial position in them, preceding the obligatory definite article. In both instances they can be inflected for number and must be case-marked.

(548) a.   Ez-zel   írta   Anna a könyvet.
           this-INS wrote.DEF Anna the book.ACC
           'Anna wrote the book with this.'

      b.   Ez-zel   a   tol-lal   írta Anna a könyvet.
           this-INS the pen-INS
           'Anna wrote the book with this pen.'

1.16.2.4. Possessive pronouns

They always follow the definite article and are constructed from a base of a personal pronoun, the possessive marker, and are inflected for number and person, and possibly for case as well, since they can stand in for full NPs.

(549) a.   a   ti   könyv-e-tek   b. a   ti-é-tek
           the you book-POSS-2PL   the you-POSS-2PL
           'your (PL) book'   'yours (PL)'

1.16.2.5. Relative pronouns

They are formed from a (sometimes optional) prefix *a-* and a base that is identical with the corresponding question-word. They are invariably placed initially in their clause, unless preceded by *mint* 'as, than' (cf. 1.8 and 1.9). They can be inflected for number and case.

1.16.3. Verb

Verbs are uniquely determined by the inflectional affixes for number and person they take, and in the case of nonauxiliaries by affixes for nonfinite forms, such as infinitive, or active, passive, adverbial, etc. participle.

1.16.4. Adjective

Adjectives, unlike nouns or numerals, can undergo gradation, and they can be modified by various adverbials, such as intensifiers.

1.16.5. Postposition

As was discussed in 1.2.4.1, it is the distinction between postpositions and case suffixes that has to be justified. Postpositions can take the *-i* attributivizer, they can be coordinated themselves, and their arguments can also be conjoined, unlike case suffixes. In addition some postpositions assign oblique cases to their arguments.

1.16.6. Numeral and quantifier

Numerals and quantifiers can take the "multiplier" affix *-szor/ször/szer* 'times' and, if in subject position and referring to human beings, they are suffixed by *-en/an* (and are taken to be plural).

(550) a. Négy férfi érkezett.
four   man arrived
'Four men arrived.'

b. Négy érkezett.
'Four (things) arrived.'

c. Négy-en érkeztek.
'Four (people) arrived.'

References

Abondolo, A. M. (1988). *Hungarian Inflectional Morphology*, Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó.

Ackerman, F. (1987). *Miscreant Morphemes: Phrasal Predicates in Ugric*, Berkeley; University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D. dissertation.

Ács, P. and Siptár, P. (1994). Túl a gondozott beszéden [Beyond careful speech style]. In: Kiefer (1994), pp. 550–580.

Alberti, G. (1996). *Passivization Types in Hungarian*, paper presented at the Third International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian, Amsterdam, January 11–13, 1996.

Bánréti, Z. (1992). A mellérendelés [Coordination]. In: Kiefer (1992a), pp. 715–796.

Bánréti, Z. (1994). Coordination. In: Kiefer and É. Kiss (1994), pp. 355–414.

Bárczi, G., Benkő, L., and Berrár, J. (1967). *A magyar nyelv története* [A History of the Hungarian Language], Budapest; Tankönyvkiadó.

Beckwith, Ch. I. (1992). Classifiers in Hungarian. In: Kenesei and Pléh (1992), pp. 197–206.

Brody, M. (1990). Remarks on the order of elements in the Hungarian focus field. In: Kenesei (1990), pp. 95–122.

Brody, M (1995). Focus and checking theory. In: I. Kenesei (ed.), *Levels and Structures* (Approaches to Hungarian V), Szeged; JATE, pp. 29–43.

Brown, R., Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In: T. A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, Cambridge; MIT Press, pp. 253–276.

Comrie, B. (1976). *Aspect*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

de Groot, C. (1989). *Predicate Structure in a Functional Grammar of Hungarian*, Dordrecht; Foris.

de Groot, C. (1995). The Hungarian converb or verbal adverbial in *-va/ve*. In: M. Haspelmath and E. König (eds), *Converbs in Cross-linguistic Perspective*, Berlin; Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 283–311.

Dik, S. (1968). *Coordination*, Amsterdam; North Holland.

Farkas, D. and Sadock J.M., (1989). Preverb climbing in Hungarian, *Language*, 69, 318–338.

Fónagy, I. and Magdics, K. (1967). *A magyar beszéd dallama* [The Melody of Hungarian Speech], Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó.

Grimshaw, J. (1990). *Argument Structure*, Cambridge; MIT Press.

Hadrovics, L. (1969). *A magyar mondattan funkcionális alapjai* [Functional Foundations for a Grammar of Hungarian], Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó.

Harlig, J. (1989). Verb form, definiteness and the given–new distinction in Hungarian, *Hungarian Studies*, 5, 243–252.

Hetzron, R. (1970). Nonverbal sentences and degrees of definiteness in Hungarian, *Language*, 46, 899–927.

Hetzron, R. (1982). Non-applicability as a test for category definitions. In: Kiefer (1982b), pp. 131–183.

Hetzron, R. (1991). Random choice pronouns in Hungarian. *Ural-Altaic Yearbook*, 63, 63–89.

Hetzron, R. (1992). Prosodic morphemes in Hungarian. In: Kenesei and Pléh (1992), pp. 141–156.

Horvath, J. (1986). *Focus in the Theory of Grammar and the Syntax of Hungarian*, Dordrecht; Foris.

Hulst, H. van der (1985). Vowel harmony in Hungarian: A comparison of segmental and autosegmental analyses. In: H. van der Hulst and N. Smith (eds), *Advances in Nonlinear Phonology*, Dordrecht; Foris, pp. 267–303.

Kálmán, C. Gy., Kálmán, L., Nádasdy, Á., and Prószéky G. (1989). A magyar segédigék rendszere [The system of auxiliaries in Hungarian]. In: F. Kiefer and Zs. Telegdi (eds), *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok*, [Studies in General Linguistics], XVII, Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 49–103.

Kálmán, L. (1985). Word order in neutral sentences. In: Kenesei (1985), pp. 13–23.

Kálmán, L., and Nádasdy, Á. (1994). A hangsúly [Stress]. In: Kiefer (1994), pp. 393–467.

Károly, S. (1982b). Intransitive–transitive derivational suffixes in Hungarian. In: Kiefer (1982b), pp. 185–243.

Kassai, I. (1994). A fonetikai háttér [Phonetic background]. In: Kiefer (1994), pp. 581–665.

Kenesei I. (ed.) (1985). *Data and Descriptions* (Approaches to Hungarian I), Szeged; JATE.

Kenesei, I. (1986). On the logic of word order in Hungarian. In: W. Abraham and S. de Mey (eds), *Topic, Focus and Configurationality*, J. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 143–159.

Kenesei, I. (ed.) (1990). *Structures and Arguments* (Approaches to Hungarian III), Szeged; JATE.

Kenesei, I. (1994). Subordinate clauses. In: Kiefer and É. Kiss (1994), pp. 275–354.

Kenesei, I. and Pléh, Cs. (eds) (1992). *The Structure of Hungarian* (Approaches to Hungarian IV), Szeged; JATE.

Kiefer, F. (1967). *On Emphasis and Word Order in Hungarian*, Bloomington; Indiana University Press.

Kiefer, F. (1982a). The aspectual system of Hungarian. In: Kiefer (1982b), pp. 293–329.

Kiefer, F. (ed.) (1982b). *Hungarian Linguistics*, Amsterdam; Benjamins.

Kiefer, F. (1991). Noun incorporation in Hungarian, *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 40, 149–178.

Kiefer, F. (ed.) (1992a). *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan I: Szintaxis* [A Structural Grammar of Hungarian I: Syntax], Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó.

Kiefer, F. (1992b). Compounding in Hungarian, *Rivista di Linguistica* 4, 61–78.

Kiefer, F. (1993). Thematic roles and compounds, *Folia Linguistica*, 27, 45–55.

Kiefer, F. (ed.) (1994). *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan II: Fonológia* [A Structural Grammar of Hungarian II: Phonology], Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó.

Kiefer, F. (ed.) (forthcoming), *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan III: Morfológia* [A Structural Grammar of Hungarian III: Morphology], Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó.

Kiefer, F. and É. Kiss, K. (eds) (1994). *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*, San Diego; Academic Press.

É. Kiss, K. (1981). Binding in a non-configurational language, *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 31, 187–218.

É. Kiss, K. (1987). *Configurationality in Hungarian*, Dordrecht; Reidel.

É. Kiss, K. (1994). Sentence structure and word order. In: Kiefer and É. Kiss (1994), pp. 1–90.

É. Kiss, K. (1996). Postposition incorporation in Hungarian, paper presented at the Third International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian, Amsterdam, January 11–13, 1996.

Komlósy, A. (1994). Complements and adjuncts. In: Kiefer and É. Kiss (1994), pp. 91–178.

Kontra, M. (1995). Does the educational level of speakers matter in Hungarian language use? In: W. Viereck (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Congress of Dialectologists*, Bamberg, 29.7.–4.8. 1990. IV Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik, Beiheft 77, Stuttgart, pp. 61–69.

Kornai, A. (1990). Hungarian vowel harmony. In: Kenesei (1990), pp. 183–240.

Lotz, K. (1939). *Das ungarische Sprachsystem*, Stockholm; Ungarisches Institut.

Marácz, L. K. (1991). *Asymmetries in Hungarian*, Donostia/San Sebastian; Diputación Foral de Gipuzkoa, University of Groningen Ph.D. dissertation, 1989.

Molnár, I. (1982). Existential relations in "hogy" sentences in Hungarian. In: Kiefer (1982b), pp. 387–426.

Nádasdy, Á. and Siptár, P. (1994). A magánhangzók [Vowels]. In: Kiefer (1994), pp. 42–182.

Olsson, M. (1992). *Hungarian Phonology and Morphology*, Lund; Lund University Press.

Papp, F. (1969). *Reverse-alphabetical Dictionary of the Hungarian Language*, Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó.

Pléh, Cs. and Radics, K. (1978). Truncated sentence, pronominalization and the text, *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 28, 91–113.

Rácz, E. (ed.) (1968). *A mai magyar nyelv* [Present-day Hungarian], Budapest; Tankönyvkiadó.

Reményi, A. (1994). Influences and values: a sociolinguistic study in the Hungarian system of address, *Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 1, 85–109.

Siptár, P. (1994). A mássalhangzók [Consonants]. In: Kiefer (1994), pp. 183–272.

Szabolcsi, A. (1992). *A birtokos szerkezet és az egzisztenciális mondatok* [Possessive Constructions and Existential Sentences], Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó, Ph.D. dissertation, Budapest, 1986.

Szabolcsi, A. (1994). The noun phrase. In: Kiefer and É. Kiss (1994), pp. 179–274.

Szabolsci, A. (1996) Verb and prefix movement in Hungarian. Unpublished paper, UCLA, Los Angeles.

Szende, T. (1976). *A beszédfolyamat alaptényezői* [The Basic Factors of Speech Flow], Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó.

Szépe, Gy. (1972). A magyar rokonsági elnevezések néhány kérdése [On some questions of kinship terms in Hungarian]. In: Zs. Telegdi and Gy. Szépe (eds), *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok*, VIII, Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó, pp. 181–199.

Terestyéni, T. (1995). Styles of knowledge and greeting habits in Hungarian, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 111, 47–55.

Tompa, J. (ed.) (1961). *A mai magyar nyelv rendszere* [The System of Present-day Hungarian], Budapest; Akadémiai Kiadó.

Tompa, J. (1968). *Ungarische Grammatik*, The Hague; Mouton.

Toth, I. (forthcoming) Negative polarity item licensing in Hungarian, *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*.

Törkenczy, M. (1994). A szótag [Syllables]. In: Kiefer (1994), pp. 273–392.

Vago, R. (1976). Theoretical implications of Hungarian vowel harmony, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 7, 243–263.

Vago, R. (1980). *The Sound Pattern of Hungarian*, Washington, D.C.; Georgetown University Press.

Váradi, T. and Kontra, M. (1995). Degrees of stigmatization: *t*-final verbs in Hungarian. In: W. Viereck (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Congress of Dialectologists*, Bamberg, 29.7.–4.8. 1990. IV, Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik, Beiheft 77, Stuttgart, pp. 132–142.

Varga, L. (1985). Intonation in the Hungarian sentence. In: Kenesei (1985), pp. 205–224.

Varga, L. (1986). Vélemények a magyar mondat hangsúlyozásáról [Views on the stress patterns of Hungarian sentences], *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*, 88, 181–188.

Varga, L. (1994). A hanglejtés [Intonation]. In: Kiefer (1994), pp. 468–549.

Vogel, I. and Kenesei, I. (1987). The interface between phonology and other components of grammar, *Phonology* 4, 243–263.

Vogel, I. and Kenesei, I. (1990). Syntax and semantics in phonology. In: D. Zec and Sh. Inkelas (eds), *The Phonology–Syntax Connection*, Chicago; University of Chicago Press, pp. 339–363.