The structure of Old Hungarian *-t* gerunds

Aims: The aim of this talk is to account for the syntax of the Old Hungarian gerund employing the non-finite ending *-t* (c.f. the lexicalized *röptében* 'on the fly', *láttára* 'at the sight of', *hallatán* 'on hearing sth', etc. forms in contemporary Hungarian).

The distribution of *-t* gerunds: As characteristic of gerunds, this non-finite form has both verbal and nominal properties: it preserves the argument structure of the base verb, and it can be modified by adverbs and negation; however, it distributes in the clause as a noun, and bears case marking according to the grammatical role it fulfills in the sentence (eg. *ültömben, voltomat*, etc). Interestingly, the *-t* gerund obligatorily bears possessive morphology. Compare the possessive agreement followed by the Accusative marker on nouns (1), and on *-t* gerunds (2). Unlike ordinary nouns, (2) has no non-possessed variant.

(1)   lelk-**ed**-et
        soul-POSS.2SG-ACC
        'your soul' (1492-1494, Festetics Manuscript 123)

(2)   haromźèr   taga-č-meǵ   [èegem-èt esmèr-t-**ed**-èt]
        three.times deny-2SG-PERF   I-ACC   know-gerund-POSS.2SG-ACC
        'you deny (your) knowing me three times' (1466, Munich Manuscript 81 va)

Gerunds with *-t* can have a controlled PRO subject (2). They can also co-occur with an overt DP that supplies a subject with independent reference. These DPs have either Nominative (3) or Dative case (4).

(3)   meg-akar-ia   ṅomoreita-ni [**èn**   ièlèn   vol-t-om-ban]
        PERF-want-3SG cripple-INF   I.NOM present be-gerund-POSS.1SG-INESSIVE
        'he wants to cripple him in my presence' (mid-15th c., Vienna Manuscript 64)

(4)   hall-ott-ac   [**o̧-nèk-i**   è   ièlènseg   te-t-è̇-t]
        hear-PAST-3PL   he-DAT-3SG this phenomenon do-gerund-POSS.3SG-ACC
        'they heard of his doing this deed' (1466, Munich Manuscript 98 vb)

Previous analysis: Tóth (2011) argues that the *-t* of *-t* gerunds spells out a nominalizing head (Nom). She takes over den Dikken's (1999) analysis of possessive structures, whereby possessors are embedded under a PP-layer, and the PP is merged as a nominal complement: $[_{NP}$ N(possessee) $[_{PP}$ P($\emptyset$/-nak) $[_{DP}$ N(possessor)$]]]$. She argues that *-t* takes a PP complement. The PP, in turn, takes the (to be nominalized) clause as its complement. The nominal functional projections are erected above the nominalizing *-t* head. Her analysis of (3) is (5).

(5) $[_{AgrP}$ *-m* $[_{PossP}$ *-o* $[_{NomP}$ *-t* $[_{PP}$ $\emptyset$ $[_{TP}$ *èn ièlèn vol-* $]]]]]$

There are several problems with this account. First, in (5) the whole clause occupies the possessor position. The clause, however, is not the possessor either semantically or morphologically; the possessor is the DP *èn*. Second, it remains a mystery why such nominalized clauses must be possessed (i.e. why PossP and AgrP are obligatorily projected on top of NomP and one cannot get **jelen volt* as a gerund). Old Hungarian has other types of nominalized clauses, too, and they can be unpossessed (and so can ordinary nouns). Third, the idea that the subject of a particular kind of non-finite clause may be either Dative or Nominative is problematic. Old Hungarian has both non-finite (infinitival) clauses with Dative subjects and non-finite (participial) clauses with Nominative

subjects, but there are no (other) non-finites with an optional Dative or Nominative case on the subject.

Proposal: I argue that all three problems may be overcome if the optionally Nominative or Dative DP (*èn* in (3)) is taken to sit outside of the nominalized clause, as a genuine possessor rather than in the clausal subject position. I take over Tóth's idea that *-t* is a nominalizing (Nom) head. I argue that *-t* takes an extended verbal projection as its complement (without the mediation of a PP layer on top), and nominalizes its complement: [$_{NomP}$ *-t* [$_{clause}$]]. The subject of the clause is invariably a controlled PRO: [$_{NomP}$ *-t* [$_{clause}$ PRO [$_{vP}$ ...]]]. As possessive morphology is obligatory in the context of *-t*, I suggest that the possessor is introduced by *-t* itself.

I shall assume with Den Dikken (1999, 2006) that possession involves a predication structure, represented in the tree by a Rel(ator)P. Rel^0 has 2 arguments: the predicate and the subject of predication. Den Dikken argues that both [$_{RelP}$ subject [$_{Rel'}$ Rel^0 predicate]] and [$_{RelP}$ predicate [$_{Rel'}$ Rel^0 subject]] are attested. I propose that the *-t* nominalizing head is a Relator. The 2 arguments of the *-t* Relator are the clause to be nominalized and the possessor DP. The structure of *-t* gerunds is thus (6), where *-t* both nominalizes its clausal complement and includes it into a predicative relation with the possessor. Other nominalizing heads in Old Hungarian are not Relators, thus they simply nominalize their complement without introducing the predicative relationship and the possessor.

(6)   [$_{RelP}$ possessor [$_{Rel'}$ Rel^0(*-t*) [clause]]]

Since arguments are obligatory, this derives that in the context of *-t* gerunds not only the extended verbal projection, but the possessor − and thus possessive morphology − is obligatory, too. Given that the bolded DPs of (3) and (4) are merged as possessors, not clause-internal subjects, their case marking is correctly expected to be either Nominative or Dative. This possessor controls the PRO subject of the nominalized clause.

In (2) there is possessive morphology on the gerund, but there is no overt possessor, and the gerund's subject is co-referent with the matrix subject *you(sg)*. Given the presence of the possessive morphology, I assume that there is a possessor in this structure, too. When the possessor is accidentally coreferent with a matrix argument, it undergoes ordinary *pro*-drop (a possibility independently attested for possessors). The structure of (2) is thus no different from the structure of (3): in both cases the gerund's subject is controlled by the possessor, which is covert in (2) and overt in (3). *Pro*-dropping the possessor is also possible if the possessor is co-referent with the object or Dative marked argument of the matrix clause.

(7)   mert   yo   volt **tee-nek-ed** [en nal-am   le-tt-ód]
         because good was you-DAT-2SG   I   ADESSIVE-1SG be-gerund-POSS.2SG
         'because it was good for you to be at my place' (1526-1527, Érdy Manuscript 510)

References: Den Dikken, M. 1999. On the structural representation of possession and agreement. The case of (anti-)agreement in Hungarian possessed Nominal Phrases. In: I. Kenesei (ed.), Crossing boundaries: Theoretical advances in Central and Eastern European languages, 137-178. Amsterdam, John Benjamins. ● Den Dikken, M. 2006. Relators and linkers: The syntax of predication, predicate inversion, and copulas. Cambridge, Mass, MIT Press. ● Tóth, I. 2011. A *-t* képzős igeneves szerkezet használata az ómagyarban. In: K. É. Kiss & A. Hegedűs (ed.), Nyelvelmélet és diakrónia, 1-13. Piliscsaba, PPKE BTK.