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The 20th Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference
University of York, York
2018 June 20th

Tamás Halm
Research Institute for Linguistics (HAS), Budapest

1. THE PROBLEM

Middle voice in Hungarian (anticausative, reflexive, dispositional middle, mediopassive and antipassive) is encoded in a seemingly confusingly complex manner:

- special verb inflection paradigm (contextual allomorphy in the subject agreement suffix conditional on voice) (a couple of verbs only):
  \[(1)\]
  \[\text{tör-Ø} \quad \text{tör-ik}\]
  break-3SG break-3SG
  ‘sy breaks sg’ ‘sg gets broken’

- special verb infl. paradigm + middle suffix (the typical case):
  \[(2)\]
  \[\text{old-Ø} \quad *\text{old-ik} \quad \text{old-ód-ik}\]
  dissolve-3SG dissolve-3SG dissolve-MID-3SG
  ‘sy dissolves sg’ ‘sg gets dissolved’

- special verb infl. paradigm. + 2 middle suffixes (the second is optional) (an innovation):
  \[(3)\]
  \[\text{lát-Ø} \quad *\text{lát-ik} \quad \text{lát-sz-ik} \quad \text{lát-sz-ód-ik}\]
  see-3SG see-3SG see-MID-3SG see-MID-MID-3SG
  ‘sy sees sg’ ‘sg can be seen / is visible / seems’

2. MAIN CLAIMS

- The current picture reflects an intermediate stage in an ongoing grammaticalization process which can be characterized as a cycle: the elements encoding middle voice lose their function and are reinforced by other elements, which in turn lose their function and are reinforced etc.
- In Old Hungarian, middle voice was encoded via a separate inflectional paradigm (contextual allomorphy in AgrS conditional on the feature content of a silent Voice head)
- In Modern Hungarian, middle voice is encoded via a separate middle voice suffix (an overt spellout of the Voice head)
- Grammaticalization involved the reinterpretation of frequentative suffixes (v heads) as middle voice suffixes (Voice heads)
- This reinterpretation was not based on shared abstract features, but rather, on a principled correlation between middle voice and frequentative aspect

---

\(^1\) I wish to thank Ágnes Bende-Farkas, Irine Burukina, Katalin É. Kiss, Veronika Hegedűs, Maria Polinsky, Orsolya Tánczos and the participants of the GLOW41 conference for their comments and advice. My research was supported by the Premium Postdoctoral Grant PPD031/2017 of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
Late Old Hungarian had two verbal conjugation paradigms: the active paradigm (the standard paradigm) and a middle paradigm (the -ik paradigm) (cf. E. Abaffy 1991):

\[ a. \ \text{szeg} \ '\text{sy cuts sg}' \rightarrow \text{szeg-ik} \ '\text{sg gets cut'} \] \hspace{0.5cm} \text{ANTICAUSATIVE}

\[ b. \ \text{mosd} \ '\text{sy washes sg}' \rightarrow \text{mosd-ik} \ '\text{sy washes herself'} \] \hspace{0.5cm} \text{REFLEXIVE}

\[ c. \ \text{gyón} \ '\text{sy confesses sg}' \rightarrow \text{gyón-ik} \ '\text{sy makes her confession'} \] \hspace{0.5cm} \text{ANTIPASSIVE}

Background: following Bartos 1999, den Dikken 1999, É. Kiss 2002 etc., I assume the following structure for the vP and the inflectional domain as my starting point: \[ \text{VP} \rightarrow \text{vP} \rightarrow \text{ModP} \rightarrow \text{TenseP} \rightarrow \text{MoodP} \rightarrow \text{AgrOP} \rightarrow \text{AgrSP} \].

Analysis A: contextual allomorphy: allomorphy of AgrS head (regular paradigm / -ik paradigm) is conditioned by the feature content of the lower silent Voice head (ACT/MID) (i.e., I assume with Alexiadou, Anagnastopoulou and Schäfer 2015 and Schäfer 2008 that VoiceP is projected, but SpecVoiceP is crucially not, in so-called marked anticausatives, and in middles in general).

\[ a. \ \text{szeg-Ø-het-Ø-ne-Ø-Ø} \] \hspace{0.5cm} \text{cut-\text{ACT-DEONT-PRES-COND-INDEF-3SG}}
\hspace{0.5cm} \text{‘sy would be able to cut sg’}

\[ b. \ \text{szeg-Ø-het-Ø-né-k} \] \hspace{0.5cm} \text{cut-\text{MID-DEONT-PRES-COND-3SG}}
\hspace{0.5cm} \text{‘sg would be able to get cut’}

This analysis supports Merchant’s (2015) Span Adjacency Hypothesis, where allomorphy is conditioned by an adjacent span (i.e., a sequence of heads in a single extended projection, Svenonius 2012). More restrictive approaches to the locality domain of allomorphy (locality within the same X0 (Bobaljik 2012 and Thornton 2017), locality within the minimal XP (Bobaljik and Harley 2017), linear adjacency/concatenation in single spellout domain (Embick 2010, Arregi and Nevins 2012)) would rule out conditional allomorphy between AgrS and Voice because of their distance.

In terms of directionality, this is an instance of inwardly-sensitive allomorphy. Note that on the assumption that vocabulary insertion eliminates the morphosyntactic features of a head (Halle 1990, Noyer 1992), such feature-triggered inwardly sensitive allomorphy has been predicted to be impossible by Bobaljik (2000). Thus, these data from Hungarian support the alternative hypothesis, i.e., that morphosyntactic features remain intact and are retained after vocabulary insertion (Halle and Marantz 1993, Noyer 1997).

\[ 2 \text{ For more details on the two paradigms, see appendix.} \]
\[ 3 \text{ MünchK (1466) 21ra: veuen aʒ čet keńěćět … mgald态 l megzmę, ÉrsK (1529-1531) 410: ýštený akaratboł harom rezre zęg sk aʒ ostja} \]
\[ 4 \text{ DebrK (1519) 517: ʒyak orchjyájath ʒym mosłotta megh, BécsK (mid-15th): meğmemolǐk uala} \]
\[ 5 \text{ JordK (1516-1519) 100: ʒyɔnmęa megh … bỳndèh, JókK (cca 1440) 53: mert pokol nem ʒyɔnǐk neked} \]
\[ 6 \text{ Bartos (1999) actually assumes a left-branching structure and derives the surface order of suffixes by assuming that the functional heads are joined to V via an operation called morphosyntactic merge, with the result that the surface order of the suffixes is the mirror image of the morphosyntactic order (Baker 1985). For ease of presentation, I decided to use a right-branching structure in this paper, but nothing hinges on this choice.} \]
• Analysis B: Voice head spelled out together with AgrS head:

\[(6)\]
\[a. \quad \text{szeg-het-Ø-ne-Ø-Ø-Ø} \]
\[\text{cut-DEONT-PRES-COND-ACT-INDEF-3SG} \]
\[\text{‘sy would be able to cut sg’} \]

\[b. \quad \text{szeg-het-Ø-né-k} \]
\[\text{cut-DEONT-PRES-COND-MID.3SG} \]
\[\text{‘sy would be able to get cut’} \]

• Arguments in favour of A and against B:
  ○ A TAM layer intervening between VoiceP and vP would be crosslinguistically atypical.
  ○ We will see later on that both the current situation in Hungarian (where the AgrS allomorphy is conditional on either V or v) and the grammaticalization process can be more straightforwardly analyzed in a conditional allomorphy framework.

4. THE COLLAPSE OF THE MIDDLE PARADIGM

The collapse of the middle paradigm (ongoing by the time of our earliest written sources and virtually complete by the 19th century) can be reconstructed as follows (cf. Simonyi 1878, 1905, D. Bartha 1991 and E. Abaffy 1991):

• Initial stage: the middle paradigm is strictly associated with middles (allomorphy conditional on the Voice head): see (4) above

• Intermediate stage 1: Some (inherently) unaccusative verbs start to follow middle paradigm (optionally) (cf. E. Abaffy 1991):

\[(7)\]
\[a. \quad \text{feküsz ‘she lies (on surface)’} \quad \text{feküsz-ik ‘she lies (on surface)’}^7 \]
\[b. \quad \text{fogy ‘it diminishes’} \quad \text{fogy-ik ‘it diminishes’}^8 \]

• Reanalysis of the conditional allomorphy: for those speakers who conjugate unaccusatives in the middle paradigm, the conditioning factor is no longer whether the Voice head is MID, but rather, whether a Spec, VoiceP is projected or not (independently of whether the non-projection of VoiceP is due to the inherent unaccusativity of the verb or the MID value of the Voice head)

• Intermediate stage 2: Some unergative verbs start to follow the middle paradigm:

\[(8)\]
\[a. \quad \text{szök ‘jump, escape’} \quad \text{szök-ik ‘jump, escape’}^9 \]
\[b. \quad \text{csúsz ‘crawl’} \quad \text{csúsz-ik ‘crawl’}^{10} \]
\[c. \quad \text{mász ‘climb’} \quad \text{mász-ik ‘climb’}^{11} \]

7 JókK (cca 1440) 159: fokzevala, TelK (1525-1531) 301: fokzom
8 WinklK (1506) 217: ez velagh megh fogja, ÉrsK (1529-1531) 215: wr Isten keresőknek nem fogj megh mőnden űo
9 TelK (1525-1531) 171: es dauid ... zø vala telles ereyuel, ÉrsK (1529-1531) 523: egyhazoknak kenczet mőnyd el lopa Es wele el zöök
gyarlóságunk...
11 BécsiK (mid-15th) 57: řič laraa a palotanac aitayhok maz, Révai Gram (1803) 953, 1029: mászik
This is a further reinterpretation of the conditioning factor: instead of the presence / absence of an external argument, the condition is now whether the verb denotes a single-argument predicate.

Final stage: Certain middle paradigm verbs start to be used with direct object:

\[(9) \text{esz-ik valami-ben 'sy eat sg-INE'} \rightarrow \text{esz-ik valamit 'sy eat sg-ACC'} \]

At this stage, the middle paradigm becomes an irregular inflectional paradigm: the allomorphy is arbitrarily conditioned by V and does not reflect any grammatical property.

Facilitating factors of the collapse of the separate middle paradigm:
- unstable in terms of learnability (Clark and Roberts 1993): middle vs. active paradigm contrasted only in the following moods / tenses: the present singular, the present conditional singular, the imperative singular and the archaic imperfect past singular
- middle voice had no separate marker: it was only visible through allomorphs which encoded to features Voice and subject phi-features (cf. Faarlund, Roberts and Roussou 2003: 16, 200, 210 on Feature Syncretism: ‘if one lexical item “spell[s] out the features of two (or perhaps more) heads” (2003:200), a reanalysis can take place’

5. THE EMERGENCE OF MIDDLE VOICE SUFFIXES

- In modern Hungarian, mediality is overtly encoded by middle suffixes (note that middles obligatorily follow the original ‘middle’ inflectional paradigm: i.e., following the middle inflectional paradigm is a necessary but insufficient condition of mediality in Mod. Hungarian):

\[(10) \begin{align*}
\text{a. -sz:} & \quad \text{lát-sz-ik} \quad \text{(see-MID-3SG)} \quad \text{‘it seems’} \quad \text{DISP. MIDDLE} \\
\text{b. -d:} & \quad \text{mos-d-ik} \quad \text{(wash-MID-3SG)} \quad \text{‘she washes herself’} \quad \text{REFLEXIVE} \\
\text{c. -(V)kVz:} & \quad \text{imád-kov-ik} \quad \text{(worship-MID-3SG)} \quad \text{‘she prays’} \quad \text{ANTIPASSIVE} \\
\text{d. -Vdik:} & \quad \text{kéver-ed-ik} \quad \text{(mix-MID-3SG)} \quad \text{‘it gets mixed’} \quad \text{ANTICAUSATIVE} \\
\text{e. -(V)kVz:} & \quad \text{üt-őd-ik} \quad \text{(hit-MID-3SG)} \quad \text{‘it gets hit’} \quad \text{ANTICAUSATIVE}
\end{align*} \]

- As has been noted by traditional historical linguists, these middle suffixes are all derived from originally frequentative suffixes.
- The (productive) frequentative suffix -gat/-get in Hungarian has functions related to causativity alternations and the verb-formation from category-neutral roots:

\[(11) \begin{align*}
\text{a. for-gat} & \quad \text{√turn-FREQ} \quad \text{‘turn-inchoative’} \\
\text{b. for-gat} & \quad \text{√turn-FREQ} \quad \text{‘turn-causative’}
\end{align*} \]

- Based on this, I assume that frequentatives in Hungarian are merged in little v (cf. Harley 1995, Marantz 1997, Harley and Noyer 2000).
- Cross-linguistically, middles are often associated with frequentative/habitual readings:
  - Antipassives where the theme argument (which could measure out the event) is demoted (Polinsky 2017)

12 JókK (cca 1440) 84: ezjé uala … a kenerben, BécsiK (mid-15th): \text{7 zenat ezjé vala}
13 Note also that the improductive frequentative suffixes -kod/-ked/-köd and -od/-ed/-öd also have a verbalizing function:

\[(i) \text{erős-köd-ik} \quad \text{strong-FREQ-3SG} \quad \text{‘keeps on insisting strongly’} \\
(ii) \text{erős-öd-ik} \quad \text{strong-FREQ-3SG} \quad \text{‘gains strength’}\]
○ Dispositional middles which ascribe a stable generic property to their argument.
• Verbs in middle voice were very likely to carry these frequentative suffixes.
• As the middle paradigm collapsed and AgrS allomorphy was no longer a reliable marker of middle voice, it was easy for language learners to reanalyze these frequentative suffixes as the markers of middle voice. (This can be related to the notion of stability in Clark and Roberts 1993: the expression of middle voice in AgrS morphology was highly ambiguous.)
• In structural terms, this was equivalent to the frequentative v head being reinterpreted as a middle Voice head.
• Significant advantage: middle voice is now transparently encoded in all moods/tenses/persons.
• Crucially, grammaticalization is not driven by feature economy: it not based on shared abstract features, but rather, comes about because of a principled correlation between middle voice and habitual/frequentative aspect.
• Probably not unique to Hungarian, e.g. the middle suffix -'ik- in Udmurt has been tentatively analyzed as etymologically related to a frequentative suffix and the antipassive in Udmurt is associated with a habitual reading (Orsolya Tánczos pc).
• The reanalysis proceeded as follows:
  ○ Middle paradigm stable, one-to-one (bidirectional) correspondence between AgrS allomorph and Voice head:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mos-} & \text{-'ik-} \\
\text{wash-FREQ-MID-3SG} & \\
\text{‘sy washes herself frequently’} & \\
\text{[[[[ V vP] FREQ vP] MID VoiceP] 3SG AgrSP]} & \\
\text{mos-} & \text{-'d-} & \text{-'ik-} \\
\end{align*}
\]

○ Middle paradigm collapses, no one-to-one correspondence between AgrS allomorph and Voice head:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mos-} & \text{-'ik-} \\
\text{wash-FREQ-MID-3SG} & \\
\text{‘sy washes herself frequently’} & \\
\text{[[[[ V vP] FREQ vP] MID VoiceP] 3SG AgrSP]} & \\
\text{mos-} & \text{-'d-} & \text{-'ik-} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Overt middle voice heads: increased transparency (visible in all tenses and moods) and learnability:

(14)  
mos-d-ik
wash-MID-3SG
'sy washes herself'
\[[[ V \_{VP} ] ~ V| ~ MID \_VoiceP ~ 3SG \_AgrSP ] ~ mos- ~ d- ~ -ik\]

6. THE BREAKDOWN OF VOICE SYNCYRETISM

After this reanalysis, a fragmented landscape of semi-productive middle suffixes emerged:

(15)  
\[-sz_\_ ~ -(V)kVz_\_ ~ -Vd_\_\]

a. \(lát-O\) \(lát-sz-ik\) *\(lát-koz-ik\) *\(lát-od-ik\)
see-3SG see-MID-3SG
'sy sees sg' 'sg can be seen / is visible' DISP. MIDDLE
b. \(imád-O\) *\(imád-sz-ik\) \(imád-koz-ik\) *\(imád-od-ik\)
worship-3SG worship-MID-3SG
'sy worships sg' 'sy is engaged in an act of worship' ANTIPASSIVE
c. \(kever-O\) %\(kever-sz-ik\) 14 *\(kever-koz-ik\) \(kever-ed-ik\)
mix-3SG mix-MID-3SG
'sy mixes sg' 'sg gets mixed' ANTICAUSATIVE

• there is no one-to-one correspondence between flavours of middle voice and different middle suffixes (each derived from different frequentative suffixes):

(16)  

a. \(szípít-koz-ik\)
beautify-MID-3SG
lit. ‘beautifies herself’, meaning: ‘does her makeup’

b. \(épít-koz-ik\)
build-MID-3SG
‘is building around, is involved in an unspecified building project’

c. \(vitat-koz-ik\)
dispute-MID-3SG
‘is involved in a debate, are debating with one another’

14 Dialectal.
• Similar to the negative cycle in French: in Stage 2 of the cycle (see Foulet 1990, Déprez 2000, Roberts and Roussou 2003), several words were grammaticalized as neg-words ('point', 'pas', 'point', 'pas', 'mie', 'crumb' or 'goutte', 'drop'), but only one of these, 'pas' survived into Stage 3 and now serves as a negator in Standard French.

• exception: with anticausatives, -V:d- emerged as a productive suffix (Komlósy 2000, Márkus 2015):

(17) töm-Ø → töm-őd-ik / *töm-sz-ik / *töm-d-ik / *töm-kez-ik / *töm-őd-ik
fill-3SG fill-MID-3SG
'sy fills sg' 'sg gets filled'

• -V:d- can also function as a medio-passive suffix

• anticausatives are not correlated with frequentative readings, so the appearance of -:Vd- in anticausatives was probably a later development based on analogy with antipassives such as csúfol-őd-ik mock-MID-3SG 'is engaged in mocking'

7. THE RISE OF SUFFIX STACKING

• some of these semi-productive suffixes are being reinforced with the productive anticausative / mediopassive suffix -V:d-, resulting in the rise of stacking (the combination of a semiproductive suffix and a productive voice alternation suffix, cf. Kozinsky et al. (1988) 661, Gerdts and Hukari 2005, Polinsky 2013))

• an ongoing process, which affects dispositional middles, while reflexives and antipassives appear to be immune:

(18) a. lát-Ø lát-sz-ik lát-sz-őd-ik
see-3SG see-MID-3SG see-MID-MID-3SG
'sy sees sg' 'sg can be seen / sg is visible / sg seems as'

b. hall-Ø hall-atr-š-ik hall-atr-š-őd-ik
hear-3SG hear-MID-3SG hear-MID-MID-3SG
'sy hears sg' 'sg can be heard / sg is audible / sg sounds as'

c. tet-sz-ik ?tet-sz-őd-ik
see.archaic-MID-3SG see.archaic-MID-MID-3SG
'sy appears favourably, sg is likeable'

d. ölel-Ø ölel-kez-ik *ölel-kez-őd-ik
embrace-3SG embrace-MID-3SG embrace-MID-MID-3SG
'sy embraces sg' 'sy embraces one another'

e. csodál-Ø csodál-koz-ik *csodál-koz-őd-ik
admire-3SG admire-MID-3SG admire-MID-MID-3SG
'sy admires sg' 'sy is astonished'

• a pattern: dispositional middles, anticausatives and mediopassives all involve agent suppression / demotion, whereas reflexives and and antipassives do not (reflexives and antipassives often display syncretism, cf. Polinsky 2017)

• note that the spread of -V:d- onto more and more flavours of middles is a step into the direction of the full restoration of voice syncretism, closing the cycle

15 Dialectal hall-ik / hall-őd-ik (also hall-sz-ik / hall-sz-őd-ik).
8. CONCLUSION

- The current picture of middle voice in Hungarian reflects an intermediate stage in an ongoing grammaticalization process which can be characterized as a cycle: the elements encoding middle voice lost their function and were reinforced by other elements, which in turn lost their function and were further reinforced etc.
- In Old Hungarian, middle voice was encoded via a separate inflectional paradigm (contextual allomorphy in AgrS conditional on the feature content of a silent Voice head).
- In Modern Hungarian, middle voice is encoded via a separate middle voice suffix (an overt spellout of the Voice head).
- Grammaticalization involved the reinterpretation of frequentative/diminutive suffixes (v heads) as middle voice suffixes (Voice heads).
- This reinterpretation was not based on shared abstract features, but rather, on a principled correlation between middle voice and frequentative aspect.

APPENDIX 1: THE MIDDLE PARADIGM

The difference of the middle paradigm from the standard paradigm manifested itself in different AgrS suffix forms. In its fullest known form, the middle paradigm differed from the standard paradigm only in the following moods/tenses: the present singular, the present conditional singular, the imperative singular and the archaic imperfect past singular. Consider:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>standard</th>
<th>middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>-ek</td>
<td>-em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>-sz</td>
<td>-el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>-O</td>
<td>-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present conditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND.1SG</td>
<td>-nék</td>
<td>-ném</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND.2SG</td>
<td>-nél</td>
<td>-nél</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND.3SG</td>
<td>-ne</td>
<td>-nék</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP.1SG</td>
<td>-jek</td>
<td>-jem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP.2SG</td>
<td>-j</td>
<td>-jél</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP.3SG</td>
<td>-jen</td>
<td>-jék</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfect past (archaic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST.1SG</td>
<td>-ék</td>
<td>-ém</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST.2SG</td>
<td>-él</td>
<td>-él</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST.3SG</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-ék</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crucially, in the praeterite past tense (which is the only past tense in Modern Hungarian), the middle paradigm and the standard paradigm have never been different (since as far as our written sources stretch back).

The erosion of the separate middle paradigm has been ongoing since the 16th century, today, the only form where the separate middle paradigm is stable is the present tense 3rd singular. Very
conservative speakers and some dialects to some extent retain the difference in the 1st and 3rd person present, present conditional and imperative forms; however, the difference in 2nd person forms has completely collapsed.
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