

Long-Distance Binding of Indeterminate Pronouns in the History of Hungarian

Ágnes Bende-Farkas
RIL–HAS

July 3, 2014

1 Introduction

Part of a larger project on the expression of quantification in Old Hungarian.

Claim: Early Old Hungarian (and possibly Proto-Hungarian) could express quantification by means of indeterminate pronouns ‘bound’ long-distance by propositional quantifiers.

Subsidiary claim: D-quantification could be a relatively recent development during the Old Hungarian period. Part of a morphological ‘compounding’ process that also yielded relative pronouns, Free Choice expressions and morphologically complex complementisers:

Complementisers: *hogy-ha* (‘that-if’), *mert-hogy* (‘because-that’).

Quantifying DPs and indefinites:

	-ki ('who')	-mi ('what')	-kor, -ha ('-time')	-hol ('where')
Q	<i>ki</i>	<i>mi</i>	<i>mikor</i>	<i>hol</i>
∀	<i>minden(-ki)</i>	<i>minden</i>	<i>minden-kor, -ha</i>	<i>minden-hol</i>
	'everyone'	'everything'	'always'	'everywhere'
∃	<i>vala-ki</i>	<i>vala-mi</i>	<i>valami-kor, valaha</i>	<i>vala-hol</i>
quasi-epistemic specific	'someone'	'something'	'at one time'	'somewhere'
	<i>né-ki</i>	<i>né-mi</i>	<i>né-ha</i>	<i>né-hol</i>
	(a certain)	a (certain)	at a certain	at a given
	someone	thing	time	place
FC	<i>akárki</i>	<i>akármi</i>	<i>akármikor</i>	<i>akárhól</i>
	'whoever'	'whatever'	'whenever'	'wherever'
Rel	<i>az-ki, ha-ki</i>	<i>az-mi</i>	<i>a/ha-mikor</i>	<i>az-hol</i>
	'who-Rel'	'what-rel'	'when-Rel'	'where-Rel'
N-words	<i>sen-ki</i>	<i>sem-mi</i>	<i>so-ha</i>	<i>se-hol</i>
	'no-one'	'no-thing'	'never'	'no-where'

Corollary: Long-distance binding of IPs by propositional operators is unselective, nested, and not sensitive to syntactic islands (Kratzer–Shimoyama). Scope: 'frozen', determined by the surface position of the operator. If Hungarian did in fact have this mode of quantification, its interface/logical properties were radically different from those of Modern Hungarian. (In Modern Hungarian, D-quantification is, as a matter of course, island-sensitive selective and local, scope relations —within islands— flexible, on account of QR.)

2 Modes of Quantification

Barbara Partee: D-quantification (determiners, quantifying DPs) vs A-quantification (adverbs, affixes, argument structure adjusters).

Old Hungarian: *minden* 'every', 'everyone' vs floating *mind* 'all', *egymin-denik* 'each'.

Shimoyama, Kratzer: long-distance quasi-binding of alternatives (supplied by indeterminate pronouns) via propositional operators. Similar to the semantics of questions (Hamblin, Karttunen) and Focus in Alternative Semantics (Rooth).

2.1 D-quantification

D-quantification is selective, local, and island-sensitive. NB, unmodified indefinites are NOT considered to be quantifiers.

- (1) *Every* cat is fond of *its* kittens. *She* caught a lot of mice.
- (2) a. *Every* professor heard the rumour that *every* student of his had been summoned to the dean's office.
 b. If *every* friend of mine comes to the party it will be a riot.
 c. *Every* semanticist moved to Tübingen because *every* computational linguist was working there.
- (3) The ambassador to/of every country was invited to the reception

OH example of narrower-than-surface scope:

- (4) Es sonha meg nem sert tyteket valamiben ha **mynden**
 and never PRT not hurt you.PL-ACC something-INE if every
 napon fogattok neky adnya eleg eledelt
 day-SUP promise-2PL DAT-3.SG give-INF enough food-ACC
 'And he (the wolf) will never cause you any harm if you promise to give him enough food every day' (Jókai C. 151)

The point of the example: the scope of *mynden napon* 'every day' is confined to the infinitival clause. (The reading is "You promise to give him enough food *every day*", and NOT "Every day, you promise to give him enough food".)

- (5) Thowaba megh nem emlekezem **soha mynden** ő
 Further PRT not remember never every he
 alnoksaghýrol
 duplicity-POSS.PL-3SG-about
 'Furthermore, I shall never recall all his duplicity' (Érsekújvári C. 77vb)
- (6) akoron wolthak wolna Ierwsalembe **sok** Irasthwdok **mýndē**
 then were PAST Jerusalem-INE many learned-men every
 nemzetekből
 nations-from
 'At the time there were in Jerusalem many learned men from every nation'
 (Érsekújvári C. 80rb)

Binding:

- (7) a. mi atyank bodog fferench **menden** miuelkedetiben
 we father-POSS.1SG blessed Francis every deed-POSS.1SG-INE
 istenhez volt hasonlatos
 god-to was similar
 ‘Our father the Blessed Francis was similar to God, in everything he did’ (Jókai C. 1)
- b. **menden** test ne győczewlkewgyék ew lelkeben
 every body not glorify-REFL-SUBJ.3SG he soul-POSS.1SG-INE
 ‘For every body it holds that he should not glorify his soul/glory in his soul’ (Jókai C. 128) OH: *minden* (‘everyone’, ‘everything’) and its ‘compounds’ (*mindenkor*, *mindenha* ‘always’), *egymindenik* (‘each and every one of them’).

2.2 A-quantification

2.2.1 Affixes and Other Stuff

In OH there was, for instance,

- Reduplication:

Reduplicated *ki* ‘who’: *ki-ki* ≈ ‘each’.

- (8) a. **ky ky mind** miwelkødethe zerenth wegón:
 who who all deed-POSS.3SG according.to take-SBJV.3SG
 awagh Iot: awagh gonozth:
 or good-ACC or evil-ACC:
 ‘Each should partake according to his deeds, whether it be of good or evil’ (Kazinczy C. 89v)
- b. **mindonok** feel tamadnak az alkolmas allapatba: meel
 every-PL up surge-3PL the appropriate state-INE which
kinek kynek nezy onnon termezettit:
 who-DAT who-DAT regard-3SG own nature-POSS.3SG-ACC
 ‘Everyone will be resurrected in the state appropriate to his nature’ (Kazinczy C. 96v–97r)

Reduplicated numerals:

- (9) a. De mert meglen keussen valanak az barátok nem
 But for yet few-N were the friars not
 boczathattyauala ewket **ketten ketten**
 send-out-POSS-PAST them two-N two-N
 ‘Since there were still not many brethren he could not send
 them out in twos’ (Jókai C. 82)
- b. ewduezeyte w ysten boczata ew tanoýtuanyt
 redeemer god sent he disciple-POSS.PL.3SG-ACC
ketten ketten menden varosba es helyre
 two-N two-N every city-into and place-onto
 ‘God the redeemer sent out his disciples in twos, to every city
 and estate’ (Jókai C. 128)
- c. (Szent Ferenc) boczata **kettewt kettewt** ez
 (Saint Francis) sent two-ACC two-ACC
 vylagotnya predicalnÿ
 this world-throughout preach-INF
 ‘Saint Francis sent his disciples in twos, to preach all over the
 world’ (Jókai C. 129)

- *-keed, -keet* as a distributivity/pluractionality operator:

- (10) a. Heten vadnak, Mel’eket, az 9 At’ok
 seven-ADV are, which-PL-ACC the she father-POSS-3PL
 az 9rdog **mynd eęenkét** kazdagon el hazasyta,
 the devil all oneADV-DIST richly away marries
 ‘They (the daughters of cupidity) are seven in number, all of
 whom their father the devil marries off generously, one by
 one’ (Székelyudvarhely C. 95r-v)
- b. Es lakozyk wala napon**keed** nagy gęenyere w seggel
 And dwell PAST day-N-LY great pleasure-INS
 ‘And he dwelt (there) with great pleasure every day’ (Érsekújvári
 C. 5r)
- (11) hogÿ ky napon**ked** eshetel w gÿan azon korsagban
 that who day-ly fall-POSS-2SG same that illness-ACC
 ‘Every day it is possible for you to come down with the same ill-
 ness’ (Érsekújvári C. 211vb)

2.2.2 Adverbs

Floating quantifiers in OH: *mind* ‘all’, *monno* ‘both’, *egymindenik* ‘each and every one of them’. A short-lived composite: *ki mind* lit. ‘who all’, a possible precursor of *minden-ki* ‘everybody’.

Floating quantifiers: no division into Restrictor and Scope; discursal.

2.3 Long-distance Binding of Indeterminate Pronouns

Japanese: indeterminate pronouns (Kuroda) that acquire existential, universal or interrogative force via (long-distance) association with certain particles.

	<i>dare</i>	<i>nani</i>	<i>dono</i>
	‘who’	‘what’	‘which’ (Det)
<i>Q</i>	<i>dare ... ka</i>	<i>nani ... ka</i>	<i>dono ... ka</i>
\exists	<i>dare ... ka</i>	<i>nani ... ka</i>	<i>dono ... ka</i>
\forall	<i>dare ... mo</i>	<i>nani ... mo</i>	<i>dono ... mo</i>

Similarly for:

- (12) [[Dono gakusei-ga syootaisita] sensei]-**mo** odotta
 which student-NOM invited teacher-mo danced
 ‘For every student x the teacher x had invited danced’ \cong
 ‘Every teacher invited by some student (from among alternative students) danced’
 –alternatives are exhausted–

Hamblin semantics: i. pronouns introduce alternatives; alternative meanings of larger constituents are computed compositionally. *Ka*, *Mo*: propositional operators that bind alternatives.

- (13) a. $\llbracket dare \rrbracket^{w,g} = \{x \mid human(w)(x)\}$
 b. $\llbracket nemutta \rrbracket^{w,g} = \{\lambda w. \lambda x. [sleep(w)(x)]\}$
 c. $\llbracket darenemutta \rrbracket^{w,g} = \{p \mid \exists x. [human(w)(x) \wedge sleep(w)(x)]\}$
- (14) [[Dono hon-o yonda] kodomo]-**mo** yoku nemutta
 which book-ACC read child -MO well slept
 ‘For every book x , the child who read x slept well’ \cong
 ‘Every child who read a book from the set of alternative book slept well’

Operators reduce the set of alternatives to a singleton.

Sentential quantifiers (Kratzer–Shimoyama): for $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{w,g} \subseteq D_{\langle s,t \rangle}$:

- (15) a. $\llbracket \exists \alpha \rrbracket^{w,g} = \{ \lambda w'. \exists p. [p \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{w,g} \wedge p(w')] \}$
 b. $\llbracket \forall \alpha \rrbracket^{w,g} = \{ \lambda w'. \forall p. [p \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{w,g} \wedge p(w')] \}$
 c. $\llbracket Neg \alpha \rrbracket^{w,g} = \{ \lambda w'. \neg \exists p. [p \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{w,g} \wedge p(w')] \}$

Mathematical properties of Hamblin style quantification:

- Nested dependencies:

- (16) $*[\dots [\dots ind \dots ka/mo] \dots] ka/mo$
 Alternatives ‘associate’ with the first available operator. In this scheme, the outermost operator cannot associate with the indeterminate pronoun.

- (17) $[[[Yamada-ga \textbf{dare-ni nani-o okutta ka}] \textit{sitteiru}] \textit{Q know syoonin}] \textbf{-mo damatteita}$
 Yamada-NOM who-DAT what-ACC sent **Q** know
 syoonin]-**mo** damatteita
 witness-mo was.silent
 ‘The witness who knew what Yamada sent to whom was also silent’
 (Here, **mo** means ‘also’)
 NOT ‘For every person x , the witness who knew what Yamada sent to x was silent.’

- The illusion of unselective binding:

- (18) $[[\textbf{Dono} \textit{gakusei-ga dono ie-ni syootaisita}] \textit{sensei}] \textbf{-odotta}$
 which student-NOM which house-to invited teacher-mo
 danced
 ‘For every student x and every house y , the teachers x had invited to y danced’ (Shimoyama 2006)

- Operators can reach across certain syntactic islands (complex NPs and adjuncts but not *wh*-islands).

- (19) $[[[[\textbf{Dono T.A.}-ga osieta] \textit{gakusei}] \textit{-ga syootaisita}] \textit{sensei}] \textbf{-mo}$
 which T.A-NOM taught student-NOM invited teacher-mo
 kita
 came

‘For every T.A. *x*, the teacher(s) invited by the students taught by *x* came’ (Shimoyama 2006)

- (20) [[[Taro-ga **nani**-o katta-kara] okotta] hito]-**mo**
 Taro-NOM what-ACC bought-because got.angry person-MO
 heya-o deteitta
 room-ACC left
 ‘For every thing *x*, the people who got angry because Taro bought *x* left the room’ (Shimoyama 2006)

- Scope is ‘frozen’: Scope is determined by the placement of the nearest operator.

3 The Landscape of Quantification in Old Hungarian Records Some Oddities

Requantification? Sensitivity to spoken discourse?

- (21) a. **mýndennemő** dolgath kýth az ő zent
 every-kind-of matter-POSS.3SG-ACC who-ACC the he holy
 attya hagýoth wolna őneký **mýndeneketh**
 father-POSS.3SG left PAST he-DAT.3SG everything-PL-ACC
 weeghezeth wolna
 finished PAST
 ‘Every affair of his, which had been ordered by his Holy Father, he brought everything to an end’ (Érsekújvári C. 68ra)
- b. az angýaloknak **mýnden** karýbol hwllottanak wala
 the angel-PL-DAT every order-POSS.PL.3PL fell PAST
 lee az athkozoth Lwcýpperrel kýk **mýnd** őneký
 down the accursed Lucifer-INS who-PL all he-DAT.3SG
 enghedeenek býnben
 yield-PST-3PL sin-INE
 ‘from every order there were angels who fell together with the accursed Lucifer, who had all yielded to him and sinned’ (Érsekújvári C. 68rb)

- (22) Ennek feletthe **mýndenek** kÿk hallÿak wala kÿ
 This-DAT above-POSS.3SG everyone who-PL hear-3PL PAST who
mýnd ew nÿelweken  keth zolwan
 each he tongue-POSS.3SG-on speak-PARTICIPLE
 ‘Furthermore, everyone who heard them, each (hearing them) speak in
 their tongue’ ( rsek jv ri C. 80va)

4 Indeterminate Pronouns in OH Codices and Elsewhere

4.1 Preliminary: IPs in (Modern) Hungarian

- Reduplicated *ki-ki* (lit. ‘who-who’) ‘each’:

- (23) *Ki-ki* menjen haza!
 Who-who go-SBJ-3SG home
 ‘Everyone (should) go home!’

- ‘Existential’ free relatives:

- (24) a. Van, *mit* ennem
 Is what-ACC eat-INF-1SG
 ‘I have something to eat’
 Lit. ‘I have what to eat’
 b. Van, *hova* mennem
 Is where go-INF-1SG
 ‘I have somewhere to go’
 Lit. ‘I have where to go’

- Partitive-existential *ki* ‘who’:

- (25) a. *Ki* j l, *ki* rosszul oldotta meg a feladatot.
 Who well, who badly solved PRT the problem-ACC
 ‘Some solved the problem correctly, and some made errors’
 b. **Ki* j l oldotta meg a feladatot
 Who well solved PRT the problem-ACC
 Intended: ‘Some solved the problem correctly’

- (26) Mert nemellÿek ez neepe^k kezzwl lakoznak
 Since some-PL this people-PL from-among dwell
 parthÿaban medÿaban **kÿk** kezzwl wannak Naap
 parthia-INE media-INE who-PL from-among are Sun
 kelethrol **kÿk** delrol **kÿk** nap nÿgothrol **kÿk**
 rise-from some South-from some Sun set-from some
 ezakrol **Nemellÿek** o kezzwlek lakoznak
 North-from Some-PL he from-among dwell
 Mesopothanÿaban ...**Nekÿk** lakoznak az thengernek keeth
 Mesopotamia-INE ...NÉ-who-PL dwell the sea-DAT two
 feleen...
 side-POSS.3SG-on...
 For some of these people dwell in Parthia, Media, some of whom
 are from the East, some from the South, some from the West and
 some from the North. Some of these dwell in Mesopotamia, ... some
 dwell on the two shores of the sea. . . ' (Érsekú^jvári C. 73ra)
- (27) zolgaÿ bewlczek walanak nagy sok tanaczot
 servant-POSS3.SG.PL wise-PL were great much advice-ACC
 tartanak wala **kÿ kÿ mÿnd** Hozza mond uala **kÿ** egÿet
 keep PAST who who all to-it say PAST who one-ACC
 kÿ masth mond wala
 who other-ACC say PAST
 'His servants were wise and gave a lot of advice; each of them
 joined in, some said this and some said that.' (Érsekú^jvári C.
 224va)

4.2 The OH Data

Query method: old-fashioned (manual & ocular). Came across data while reading codices. In all, found about 10 occurrences (one or two of which can be analysed as correlative/relative operators).

- (28) tevzet ievttem bochatny fevldre. es **myt** akarok
 fire-ACC come-PST-1SG release-INF earth-SUB and what-acc want-1SG
 egyebet. hanem chak hog eegyen.
 else-ACC if-not only that burn-SBJV.3SG
 'I've come to release fire onto earth, and what (else) do I want but for it

to burn’ (Cornides 65 r–v)

‘I’ve come to release fire on earth, and I want nothing else but for it to burn’

myt: interrogative in (rhetorical) question (‘what else do I want but...’) or bound by (implicit) negation (‘I want nothing else but...’).

- (29) Az yo lelke embernek kedeeg nagyob erdemót zerez
the good natured man-DAT CONJ bigger merit-ACC acquire
vele chak **ky** neky ne enghegyen
INST.3SG just who DAT-3SG not yield-SBJV.3SG
‘(The devil’s temptations) (only) increase the merits of good souls; it is just that no-one should yield to them’ (Érdy C. 82b)
‘(The devil’s temptations) only serve to multiply the merits of good souls; the key is that no-one is to yield to them’

ky ‘who’ bound by negation.

- (30) Es tehat latek tewz langott menbelewl lejtewtt
And so saw-SG1 fire flame-ACC heaven-from descend-PART-ACC
...de az egyebekrewl **nem** tudok **mýtt**
...but the other-PL-about not know-SG1 what-ACC
‘I saw a flame descending from Heaven ... but I know nothing about the rest’ (Jókai Codex 45)

mýtt ‘what’ bound by negation. Clear from syntactic context that it is not an embedded question (à la ‘I don’t know what to say’).

- (31) Ha **ky** kerdenee honnan volt az. Azzonywnk
if who ask-COND.3SG where-from was that. lady-POSS.1PL
marianak hogy semy terheet nehességeet nem zenwette
Mary-DAT that none burden-ACC difficulty-ACC not suffered
legyen Reea felelnek doctorok mondwan.
be-SBJV.3SG SUB-3SG reply-3PL doctors say-PART ...
‘Should someone ask how come that Our Lady Mary had no difficulty (in giving birth) learned men reply saying ...’ (Érdy C. 44a)

ky immediately following *Ha* ‘if’: default existential closure, universal reading in virtue of conditional. (Donkey sentence.)

- (32) Ha keddeeg **my** kewessee annal nagyobot zolt
 if CONJ what little-TRANS that-ADE bigger-ACC speak-PST.3SG
 volna. hyzóm hogy mind ez vylaag sem
 be-COND believe-1SG that all this world neither
 foghatta volna meg
 catch-POSSIB-PERF.3SG be-COND PRT
 ‘And if he (St John) had spoken somewhat louder / any louder I believe
 that not even the whole wide world could have grasped it’ (Érdy C. 54a)

my: default existential closure, universal reading in virtue of conditional. (Donkey sentence.)

- (33) De ha **kÿ** kerdene mÿ leegÿen az eredet zerent
 But if **who** ask-COND.3SG what be-SUBJ.3SG the origin acc.to
 walo ÿgassagh ... wgÿ mond zent Anselmws doctor...
 be-PARTICIPLE truth ...so says saint Anselm doctor...
 ‘Should someone ask what original truth should be ... Doctor Saint Anselm
 says ...’ (Érsekújvári C. 289 r)

kÿ ‘who’ existentially closed, universal construal due to conditional. (Donkey sentence.)

- (34) Ha **mÿ** fogÿatkozásnak keddeeg tórteenÿk esnÿ ... Vala kÿ meg
 If what deficiency-DAT CONJ happen fall-INF ... some one PRT
 erthetÿ es twdhattÿa semÿ ellensees nem leezen
 understand-POSS and know-POSS no antagonism not will-be
 oka ha meg emendallÿa
 reason-POSS.3SG if PRT correct
 ‘Should there be any deficiencies (in this text) let it be understood (by
 anyone) that there will be no resentment if they are corrected’ (Érdy C.
 3a)

mÿ ‘what’ existentially closed, universal construal due to conditional.

- (35) Mÿkoron keddeeg ÿwtot vona az patakra kÿn az
 When CONJ arrived the stream-onto which-on the wood-ACC
 ffaat atal vetettek vala. mÿnth ha **kÿ** meg mondotta vona. ottan
 across hurled PAST like if who PRT said PAST there PRT

megh ýsmeree lelkeeben
 recognized soul-POSS.3SG-INE
 ‘When she (the Queen of Sheba) reached the stream bridged by the wood
 (that would be used in the Holy Cross), it was as if someone had told her,
 she recognized it in her soul’ (Érdy C. 289b)

kÿ – default existential closure (under modal/counterfactual).

- (36) ha **kÿnek** valamÿre enghedelmet hagÿott volna es nem
 if who-DAT something-onto permission-ACC left PAST and not
 tette volna ... azokat nagyÿ eressen megħ feddÿ vala
 did PAST ...those great strongly PRT reprimand PAST
 ‘If (whenever) he ordered someone to do something, and they failed to
 do it, those were severely reprimanded’ (Érdy C. 298b)

Could be correlative; **kÿnek** (‘to whom’) could as well be a free pronoun bound
 by existential closure (universal construal: donkey effect).

- (37) Es azert valamÿkoron **mÿtt** zoluala zent ferenczrewl mondÿa
 And thus when(-ever) what-ACC say-pst saint francis-about say-Pst
 uala ffrat(er) lleo En dragalatosim mend nagyÿok: de zent fferencz es
 Pst brother Leo My dears all great-PL but Saint Francis too
 nagyÿ
 great
 ‘So, whenever Brother Leo said something about Saint Francis, he would
 say: ‘My dears, they are all great, but Saint Francis is also great’ ’ Or:
 ‘‘So, whenever Brother Leo said anything about Saint Francis, he would
 say: ...’’ (Jókai Codex, 44)
 Latin source: ‘Et propter hoc quandocumque aliqui loquebantur de sanc-
 tis, frater Leo dicebat. ...’

mÿtt is either bound by existential closure, or the subordinate clause is understood
 as a correlative, and *mÿtt* is a relative–correlative operator.

- (38) Azerth **mÿdē** Ember ezeben wegÿe hogy **kÿ**
 Thus every man mind-POSS.3SG-INE take-SUBJ.3SG that who
mÿkoron ÿwtand o halalanak ÿdeere
 when reach he death-POSS.3SG-DAT time-POSS.3SG-onto
 Naggÿal Nehezeb Es erÿsseb kesertethek leznek
 greatly heavier and stronger temptations be-FUT.3SG

‘Thus everyone should bear in mind that whoever, whenever (he) reaches the hour of his death he will have to face much stronger temptations’ (Érsekújvári C. 136va)

k̄y can be a correlative pronoun, but it can also be a free, universally generalised pronoun.

Indeterminate pronouns could be full DPs, but they could also be determiner-like or modifier-like elements in the DP (as in Japanese).

Indeterminate pronouns have been detected in the following environments:

- Sentence-initially, with a partitive construal.
- In the scope of negation.
- In antecedents of conditionals, where they are taken to be existentially closed. Universal reading due to conditional.
- Taken for granted: interrogative and relative (correlative) contexts. In relative clauses and correlatives, morphologically simple pronouns freely alternate with morphologically complex pronouns (even in Modern Hungarian).
- Reduplicated *ki-ki* (lit. ‘who-who’, meaning ‘each’): either a distributivity operator on its own, or an indeterminate complex bound by a covert distributivity operator.

4.3 Discussion

The presence of indeterminate pronouns in OH codices is not surprising, given that morphologically complex quantifiers, FC items, relative operators a.s.o. are Hungarian developments (Benkő 1993), even if their components often go back to Finno-Ugric roots. When the codices were written such complexes could be judged as relatively recent.

A complex like *vala-ki* (‘somebody’) or *akár-ki* (‘whoever’) or *minden-hol* (‘every-where’) can be said to consist of a pronoun (made determinate, as it were), and an operator/a semantic marker for a quasi-epistemic or a FC construal. Tentatively, these compounds can be said to date from the Proto-Hungarian or Early Old Hungarian period. The expression *mind* ‘all’ (which is also the root morpheme in

minden ‘every-’, ‘everything’, ‘everybody’) also consists of an indeterminate pronoun (*mi* ‘what’ and an adverbial suffix *-n(d)*, which could have been interpreted as a maximality operator).

⇒ Before such compounds emerged, quantification in OH could have been expressed with A-quantifiers (adverbials and affixes) and propositional ‘binders’ of indeterminate pronouns. Not clear: whether Proto-Hungarian or Proto-Uralic had determiner quantification, which became obsolete.

⇒ IF D-quantification (in its present form) is taken to be a PH/Early OH development, and IF it is taken to be preceded by a mix of A-quantification and long-distance propositional quantification, it follows, from comparing the logical properties of the two modes of quantification, that the emergence of D-quantification has brought about a rather abrupt and radical shift in the logical architecture of the language.

Two remarks:

1. Long-distance propositional quantification over alternatives has possibilities of expression which may or may not have been fully exploited in Hungarian. The possibility was nevertheless there.
2. Reconstructing/extrapolating quantificational properties: this is not reconstruction as such, since mathematical properties of long-distance binding follow *directly* from Hamblin semantics.

Primary Sources

Cornides Codex 15141519. András Bognár and Ferenc Levárdy (eds.), *Cornides kódex*. Facsimile, and critical edition. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó 1967.

Érdy Codex 15241527. Unpublished transcription of the original text, received from the Sermones project at Eötvös University (Budapest), <http://sermones.elte.hu/erdy/>.

Érsekújvár Codex 1529–1531. Lea Haader (ed.) *Érsekújvári kódex*. Transcription of the original record and facsimile. Budapest: Tinta 2013.

Jókai Codex After 1372/around 1448. János P. Balázs (ed.), *Jókai-kódex*. Transcription of the original record, the corresponding Latin text, with introduction and notes. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1981.

Bach et al 1995

Bende-Farkas OUP

Bende-Farkas univex

Bende-Farkas ICSH

Bende-Farkas MASZAT

Bende-Farkas Nyelm

Grosu, Alexander 2004: The Syntax–Semantics of Modal Existential Constructions. O. Tomić et al eds. *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. LA 67. John Benjamins: Amsterdam.

Kratzer

Kratzer–Shimoyama

Partee

Shimoyama

Watanabe

References

Crisma, P. and Longobardi, G. (eds): 2009, *Historical Syntax and Linguistic Theory*, Oxford University Press.

Farkas, D.: 2002, Extreme non-specificity in romanian, John Benjamins, pp. 127–151.

Grosu, A.: 2004, The Syntax–Semantics of Modal Existential Constructions, in O. M. Tomić (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, number 67 in *Linguistik Aktuell*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 405–438.

Kratzer, A.: 2005, Indefinites and the operators they depend on: from Japanese to Salish, in G. Carlson and F. Pelletier (eds), *Reference and Quantification: The Partee Effect*, CSLI Publications, Palo Alto, pp. 113–42.

Kratzer, A. and Shimoyama, J.: 2002, Indeterminate pronouns: The view from Japanese, in Y. Otsu (ed.), *Proceedings of Third Tokyo Psycholinguistics Conference*, Hituzi Syobo, Tokyo.

Watanabe, A.: 2009, A parametric shift in the D-system in Early Middle English: relativization, articles, adjectival inflection, and indeterminates, in Crisma and Longobardi (2009), pp. 321–74.