Veronika Hegedűs & Katalin Gugán
(Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences)

Two word order variations in Old and Middle Hungarian and how they are related

Aims and claims: In this paper we examine two sets of empirical data from Old and Middle Hungarian texts: One is the structure of negation, where we argue for a long-term coexistence of two derivations, resulting in two surface word orders of verb modifiers with respect to the verb and negation. The other is the word order of verb clusters (mainly involving two verbs) and the finite verbs involved in them. For the latter, it will be argued that their lexical and syntactic properties did not make verb cluster formation ("restructuring") obligatory in Old and Middle Hungarian, and the fact that they exhibited an unexpected word order can be attributed to the different properties of negation and to the remnant OV properties of the Hungarian extended VP.

Data: There is a handful of verbs (*fog* 'will, future aux.', *akar* 'want', *kell* 'need') in Hungarian that take an infinitival complement and form a close syntactic unit with it, including the potential verb modifier (VM: verbal particle or other primary or secondary predicate or a bare nominal internal argument) of the infinitival verb. The word order of these constructions in Old and Middle Hungarian shows an important difference in neutral sentences and under negation. Today these verb clusters (e.g. É. Kiss & van Riemsdijk 2004) or verbal complexes (Koopman & Szabolcsi 2000) exhibit a word order where the finite (auxiliary-like) verb has to be preceded by either its infinitival complement or the VM of the infinitive in neutral sentences, while in non-neutral sentences, i.e., under focus or negation, the VM/infinitive does not move to the preverbal position. This has been analyzed in various ways, but the verbs have been taken to be either phonologically defective (stress-avoiding, e.g. Kálmán et. al 1986, Csirmaz 2004, Szendrői 2004) or semantically defective (see Koopman and Szabolcsi's 2000 suggestion). The Old and Middle Hungarian data show that (i) these verbs could stand on their own bearing main stress and without inverting the infinitive/VM (1), and (ii) appeared in the order where the VM of their complement preceded negation (2), which is ungrammatical today, unless the VM is contrastive. Therefore, we examine the properties of the three above-mentioned verbs in neutral and negated sentences in order to shed light on the syntactic properties of verb clusters and of negation as well.

(1) akar-ia uala ǫtèt titkon èl had-ni
want-DEF.3SG COP (s)he.ACC secretly away leave-INF
'was minded to put her away privily.' (Munich C. 8 va, 1466, Mt. 1,19)

(2) hogy az Buza-já-t el nem akar-t-a vin-ni
that the wheat-POSS.3SG-ACC away not want-PST-DEF.3SG take-INF
'that (s)he did not want to take his/her wheat away' (WitchT. 218, 1729)

Negative sentences in earlier stages of Hungarian (up to Early Modern Hungarian) come in two seemingly neutral word order variants when there is a VM in the clause: the order that is prevalent in Modern Hungarian, which is NEG V VM, and a today pragmatically marked order, VM NEG V. It has been proposed that the first variant in (3) is a remnant OV property of the language (É. Kiss 2014), and that negation is inserted into the structure by adjoining to the verb, as opposed to the innovative "inverted" word order (4), which can be derived by inserting negation higher in the structure in a NegP and moving the verb to that head, thus leaving the VM behind.

(3) és le nem dő̵̊´l-t
and down not lean-PST.3SG
'and it fell not' (Káldi 906, 1626; Mt. 7, 25)

(4) & nē èſ-et le
and not fall-PST.3SG down
'and it fell not' (Munich C. 13 vb, 1466; Mt. 7,25)

Proposal: We argue (adapting É. Kiss' 2014 proposal) that the derivation of negation involved two distinct processes in Old and Middle Hungarian: (i) the inverse order is derived by inserting the negative *nem* into the specifier of NegP and moving the V into Neg, while (ii) the "conservative" derivation adjoins *nem* to the VP, leaving the verb in situ and, therefore, following the pre-verbal VM, which is in the specifier of a functional projection responsible for complex predicate formation (PredP). The two constructions seem to have coexisted in virtually stable distribution for a long time; e.g., in the case of preverbal particles, the rate of the "conservative" pattern was above 80% in most of the examined sources in Old and Middle Hungarian. However, during the 19th c. the "conservative" order lost ground and became pragmatically marked, which led to the structure being reanalyzed as involving regular negation and a left-peripheral emphatic VM (focus, according to Piñon 1991).

The two distinct derivations for negation are also significant when considering the behavior of VMs in verb clusters. We argue that verbs like, *akar* 'want', *kell* 'need' or *fog* 'future aux.' were not necessarily "restructuring verbs" in Old and Middle Hungarian: the fact that they could be the main predicate in their matrix clause alone, and their infinitival complement or its VM could stay post-verbal, supports this. In neutral sentences, the matrix verb could stand on its own (5a) or move to the Pred head and form a complex predicate with the VM that moved up to the matrix clause (5b). As long as the verb did not need semantic support, the syntactic movement was also optional, but (5b) became the regular construction when they grammaticalized to some extent and became auxiliaries. When the infinitival complement does not have a VM, the infinitive moves (an XP smaller than a full clause, which is generally considered to be a VP)

(5) a. $[_{VP}$ V $[_{CP}$ (XP) VM V_{inf} …]]

b. $[_{PredP}$ VM $[_{Pred'}$ Pred+V $[_{VP}$ ~~V~~ $[_{CP}$ (XP) ~~VM~~ $V_{inf}]]]]$

c. $[_{PredP}$ XP $[_{Pred'}$ Pred+V $[_{VP}$ ~~V~~ $[_{XP}$ ~~V_{inf}~~ $]]]]$

The lexical and syntactic change in the case of the auxiliary(-like) verbs, such as *akar* 'want' concerned their status as possible main predicates in this use: later on they always had to form a complex predicate with their complement infinitival verb or its VM in neutral sentences. The complement clauses they select used to include inflected infinitives, while today *akar* and *fog* always select non-inflected infinitives (contra *kell* 'need').

In negative sentences, the predication structure is different and there is no complex predicate formation with the negated matrix verb. The main remaining concern is, then, why we still had VM NEG V Vinf orders in Old and Middle Hungarian. Our answer to this question is that VM movement to the matrix clause could take place for two reasons in Old and Middle Hungarian: (i) to form a complex predicate with the matrix verb and form a verb cluster (just like in Modern Hungarian, but today it is obligatory); (ii) to derive a more OV-like structure, where either the full infinitival complement or at least part of it is in a designated position, preceding the finite verb. If a larger structure moved, we could end up with a larger phrase, possibly a full infinitival clause preceding the negated main verb, much like a roll-up structure of a verb cluster on the surface.

Selected references: É. Kiss, K. 2014. The evolution of functional left peripheries in the Hungarian sentence. In *The evolution of functional left peripheries in Hungarian syntax*. ed. K. É. Kiss, 9–55. Oxford, OUP • É. Kiss, K. & H. van Riemsdijk (eds) 2004. *Verb Clusters: A Study of Hungarian, German and Dutch*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. • Kálmán, L., G. Prószéky, Á. Nádasdy & C. Gy. Kálmán. 1986. Hocus, Focus, and verb types in Hungarian infinitive constructions. In *Topic, Focus, and Configurationality*, ed. W. Abraham & S. de Meij, 129–142. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. • Koopman, H. & A. Szabolcsi. 2000. *Verbal complexes*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.