

ON THE DIACHRONY OF ASPECTUAL COGNATE OBJECTS IN HUNGARIAN

Aims and preliminaries: The aim of the talk is two-fold. On the one hand, we demonstrate that some Hungarian pseudo-objects (POs) following intransitive activity (1) or semelfactive verbs (2) are not only situation delimiters (Csirmaz 2008: 177) but they also have the role of the aspectual cognate object (ACO):

- (1) a. *aludni egyet/ egy jót/ egy mélyet* b. *mosolyogni egyet/ egy nagyot/ egy széleset*
to.sleep one.ACC one good.ACC one deep.ACC to.smile one.ACC one big.ACC one wide.ACC
'to sleep a (good/sound) sleep' 'to smile a (big/wide) smile'
- (2) a. *kattanni egyet/ egy isteneset* b. *tüsszenteni egyet/ egy félelmeteset*
to.click one.ACC one thorough.ACC to.sneeze one.ACC one dreadful.ACC
'to click a (thorough) click' 'to sneeze a (dreadful) sneeze'

Hungarian lacks the exact counterpart of the English ACOs of the type *to sleep a sound sleep* (cf. **aludni egy mély alvást* '(lit.) to sleep one sound sleep.ACC') or *to smile a wide smile* (cf. **mosolyogni egy széles mosolyt* '(lit.) to smile a wide smile.ACC'). As shown by the above examples, this language has the following three classes of POs that fulfil the function of the ACO (only members of the first two classes have attracted syntactic and semantic attention in the literature but they have not been analysed as ACOs; cf. Kiefer 1992, 1994, 2006; Piñón 2001; É. Kiss 2004; Csirmaz 2008; Halm 2012; Farkas 2017; Farkas & Kardos 2018, 2019):

- (a) the PO *egy* 'one.ACC', the lexical content of which is bleached and has a purely aspectual role
(b) the POs (*egy*) *jót* '(one) good.ACC', *jókat* 'good.PL.ACC', (*egy*) *nagyot* '(one) big.ACC', *nagyokat* 'big.PL.ACC', (*egy*) *hatalmasat* '(one) huge.ACC', *hatalmasakat* 'huge.PL.ACC', (*egy*) *óriásit* '(one) gigantic.ACC' or *óriásikat* 'gigantic.PL.ACC'
(c) POs such as (*egy*) *mélyet* '(one) deep.ACC/sound.ACC', (*egy*) *széleset* '(one) wide.ACC', (*egy*) *isteneset* '(one) thorough.ACC' or (*egy*) *félelmeteset* '(one) dreadful.ACC'¹

On the other hand, we present the diachrony of these and similar POs. We show that, similarly to English ACOs (Lavidas 2018, van Gelderen 2018), Hungarian ACO-like elements are a recent development of the language.

Hungarian POs are ACOs: Following Horrocks & Stavrou (2010) and Lavidas (2013a, 2013b, 2014, 2018), we argue that ACOs are non-referential and non-thematic nominals, which occur with prototypical unergative verbs, cannot be replaced by similar nouns (e.g. hyponyms or synonyms) and the main function of the VP is the expression of a limited event with beginning and end (i.e. the ACO delimits the event of the verb). We show that the above Hungarian POs share the (syntactic) properties of English ACOs in terms of the tests of passivization, theta-role assignment, pronominalization, definiteness restriction, restrictive relative clause modification, questioning and aspectual contribution (cf. Jones 1988; Moltmann 1989; Massam 1990; Macfarland 1994; Tenny 1994; Matsumoto 1996; Horita 1996; Kuno & Takami 2004; de Swart 2007; Puigdollers Real 2008; Horrocks & Stavrou 2010). Besides (i) verbal particles and resultative phrases of change of state/location and (ii) quantized objects of creation and consumption predicates, these and similar POs are argued to be another strategy to mark situation aspect in Hungarian (cf. esp. Farkas & Kardos 2019).

On the diachrony of ACOs in Hungarian. Presentation and analysis: The analysis of the diachronic evolution of these and similar POs is based on the following online databases of the Research Institute of Linguistics within the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (RIL-HAS):

- (i) Old Hungarian Corpus containing Old Hungarian (OH, 896–1526) codices and miscellaneous minor texts (*Ómagyar Korpusz*)
(ii) the database containing Old and Middle Hungarian (MiH, 1526–1772) records and private correspondence (*Történeti magánéleti korpusz*)
(iii) the New Hungarian historical database, a collection of diverse texts belonging to different genres and written in different styles in the Early Modern Hungarian (EMH, 1772–1920) and Modern Hungarian (MH, 1920–present) periods (*Új Magyar történeti szövegtár*)

The careful examination of these databases reveals the following aspects. First, as far as the matrix verb is concerned, we notice that its number increases considerably and a wider variety of verbs take the PO. Whereas in our MiH corpus only 1 semelfactive and 12 different activity verbs take the PO *egy* 'one.ACC', in the first part of the EMH period (1801–1850) 17 different semelfactive and 41 different activity verbs. Their number continues to increase: by the second half of the MH period (1950–2000) in our corpus we encounter 69 different semelfactive and 134 different activity verbs occurring with this PO.

¹ In both classes, *egy* 'one' is obligatory in postverbal (e.g. *aludni *(egy) jót*) but impossible in preverbal position (e.g. **(egy) jót aludni*).

Second, with respect to the PO *egyed* ‘one.ACC’ (and its variants *eggyed/edjet/edgyed/egjet/egiet/eggiet/egyedis/édgyedis*), we notice its gradual numerical increase and frequency of use (43 occurrences in OH and MiH, 528 in EMH and 1129 in MH). Interestingly, we witness the same type of diachronic change in the case of POs belonging to class (b) as well: (*egy*) *nagyod* ‘(one) big.ACC’ and *nagyokat* ‘big.PL.ACC’, which occur with a wide variety of semelfactive verbs (20 occurrences in OH and MiH, 596 in EMH and 1056 in MH); (*egy*) *jód* ‘(one) good.ACC’ and *jókat* ‘good.PL.ACC’ (1 occurrence in OH and MiH, 75 in EMH and 168 in MH); (*egy*) *hatalmasat* ‘(one) huge.ACC’ and *hatalmasakat* ‘huge.PL.ACC’ (no occurrence in OH and MiH, 6 in EMH and 57 in MH) and (*egy*) *óriásit* ‘(one) gigantic.ACC’ and *óriásikat* ‘gigantic.PL.ACC’ (no occurrence in OH and MiH, 4 in EMH and 7 in MH). POs belonging to class (c) undergo change in the same direction, although their first occurrences are registered only from the second half of the EMH period: e.g. *erőset* ‘strong.ACC’ (1840), *éleset* ‘sharp.ACC’ (1875), *egy vidámat* ‘one joyful.ACC’ (1928), *keserveset* ‘bitter.ACC’ (1931), *hangosat* ‘loud.ACC’ (1949), *boldogat* ‘happy.ACC’ (1952), etc. In sum, there is the same gradual numerical increase and frequency of use in the three classes of POs. In this respect, the PO *egyed* ‘one.ACC’ fulfilling the function of the ACO appears in the MiH period (with only one occurrence in the OH period), it becomes increasingly frequent in the EMH period (when its occurrence is also ‘completed’ by the emergence of the POs of the (b) class) and extremely frequent and very numerous in the MH period (when its occurrence is ‘completed’ not only by the high frequency of the POs of the (b) class but also by the emergence of the POs of the (c) class). To put it differently, whereas the PO *egyed* ‘one.ACC’ appears in the MiH period, other POs with the same aspectual function (but more lexical content) appear later – either in the first or in the second half of the EMH period – but they all contribute to enriching the larger class of ACOs in Hungarian.

The careful examination of the collected data sheds light on one important change in word-order: in OH and MiH *egyed* ‘one.ACC’ precedes the (activity) verb (cf. (3a)); in EMH the preverbal and postverbal positions compete with each other (cf. (3b)); and in MH only the postverbal position is available for the PO (cf. (3c)):

- | | | | | | |
|----------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| (3) a. <i>edgyed</i> | aluván | b. <i>egyed</i> | mosolyog/ sóhajtottunk <i>egyed</i> | c. alszik | <i>egyed</i> |
| one.ACC | sleeping | one.ACC | smiles sighed | one.ACC | sleeps |
| ‘sleeping one sleep’ | | ‘he smiles a smile/we sighed a sigh’ | | | ‘he sleeps one sleep’ |

We believe that the change from the preverbal to the postverbal position reflects the change from the Proto-Hungarian OV to the Old Hungarian VO word-order. In other words, this non-referential PO undergoes the same word-order change between the 18th and 20th century as other referential objects between the above-mentioned two periods (É. Kiss 2014: 33).

On the diachrony ACOs and (aspectual) verbal particles in Hungarian: The diachronic changes of these and similar POs fulfilling the function of the ACO in Hungarian parallel the diachronic changes (e.g. gradual numerical increase and frequency of use) of verbal particles marking telicity in this language (É. Kiss 2008; Hegedűs 2014a, 2014b). In addition, it is claimed (É. Kiss 2008: 130) that the emergence of such verbal particles has contributed to the gradual disappearance of viewpoint aspect marking. Whereas in OH viewpoint aspect is marked by a rich system of verbal inflection, it is slowly simplified until it gradually disappears from standard Hungarian in the MiH period, and this loss is ‘compensated for’ by the gradual appearance of telicity-marking verbal particles. If the appearance of situation aspect marking is followed by the disappearance of viewpoint aspect marking in Hungarian (and other languages; cf. É. Kiss 2008: 148) and Hungarian POs having the role of the ACO are another class of elements used to mark situation aspect in this language (cf. above), we can conclude that the gradual disappearance of viewpoint aspect marking is also triggered by the above-presented diachronic changes in the three subclasses of ACO-like elements.

Selected references: Csirmaz, A. 2008. Accusative Case and Aspect. In K. É. Kiss (ed.), *Event Structure and the Left Periphery*, 159-200, Springer. É. Kiss, K. 2004. Egy igekötő elmélet vázlatja. *Magyar Nyelv* 100: 15-42. É. Kiss K. 2008. *From the grammaticalization of viewpoint aspect to the grammaticalization of situation aspect*. In K. É. Kiss (ed.), *Event Structure and the Left Periphery*, 129-157, Springer. É. Kiss K. 2014. *Az ősmagyar SOV szörendőtől az ómagyar ’Topik-Fókusz-V-X*’ szörendőig*. In K. É. Kiss (ed.), *Magyar Generatív Történeti Mondattan*, 14-33, Akadémiai Kiadó. Farkas I.-Á. & Kardos É. 2018. Non-maximal event delimitation in Hungarian. *Argumentum* 14: 368-382. Farkas I.-Á. & Kardos É. 2019. A végpontosság mint szituációs aspektuális jegy jelölése a magyar nyelvben. 2. rész. *Magyar Nyelv* 3: 298-308. van Gelderen, E. 2018. *The Diachrony of Verb Meaning. Aspect and Argument Structure*, Routledge. Halm T. 2012. Unergative and/or Unaccusative: On the Argument Structure, Semantics and Syntax of Semelfactives in Hungarian. In B. Surányi and D. Varga (eds.), *Proceedings of the First CECIL for postgraduate students*, 104-117, PPKE. Hegedűs V. 2014a. A névutós kifejezések grammatikálizációja és belső szerkezeti változásai. In: K. É. Kiss (ed.), *Magyar Generatív Történeti Mondattan*, 154-176, Akadémiai Kiadó. Hegedűs V. 2014b. The Cyclical Development of Ps in Hungarian. In K. É. Kiss (ed.), *The Evolution of Functional Left Peripheries in Hungarian Syntax*, 122-147, Oxford University Press. Kiefer F. 2006. *Aspektus és akcióminőség. Különös tekintettel a magyar nyelvre*. Akadémiai Kiadó. Lavidas, N. 2018. Cognate noun constructions in Early Modern English. The case of Tyndale’s New Testament. In: Cuyckens, H. et al. (eds.) *Explorations in English Historical Syntax*, 51-76, John Benjamins. Piñón, C. 2001. Töprengtem egyet: azon, hogy mit jelent az *egyed*. In: M. Bakró-Nagy et al. (eds.), *Újabb tanulmányok a strukturális magyar nyelvtan és a nyelvtörténet köréből*, 182-198, Osiris.