DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 859

FL 003 193

AUTHOR   Orosz, Robert A.
TITLE   A Contrastive Analysis of English and Hungarian
                Grammatical Structure. Final Report.
INSTITUTION   Indiana Univ., Bloomington.
SPONS AGENCY   Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau
                of Research.
BUREAU NO   BR-8-E-036
CONTRACT   OEC-0-8-080036-3692-014
NOTE   336p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16
DESCRIPTORS   *Comparative Analysis; Contrastive Linguistics;
                Descriptive Linguistics; *English; Grammar;
                *Hungarian; *Interference (Language Learning);
                Morphology (Languages); Nominals; Numbers; Pronouns;
                Second Language Learning; Semantics; Sentence
                Structure; *Structural Linguistics; Syntax; Time;
                Transformation Generative Grammar; Verbs

ABSTRACT
                This study, contrasting grammatical structures in
English and Hungarian, considers those areas of grammar in the two
languages which would cause the greatest interference for the native
English speaker learning Hungarian. The choice of topics is based on
the author's personal observation, both of English speakers learning
Hungarian and of Hungarian native speakers speaking English, and on a
study of grammars of various kinds. The first part considers the
article in general, and, in particular, the definite, indefinite, and
zero article. Part 2 considers the category of definiteness, the
definite article as a marker of definiteness, anaphoric and
non-anaphoric definite personal pronouns, reflexive and demonstrative
pronouns, the -ik pronouns and their English equivalents, indefinite
pronouns, proper nouns, possessive constructions, and noun clauses.
The third part involves morpho-syntax and considers such topics as
sentence word order, interrogative and negative sentences, and
phrasal verbs. Part 4 covers grammatical-semantic notions: time and
tense usage, aspect, the category of number, and semantic
considerations of number. References are listed. (VM)

$\dot{B}R\ 8\ E\ C36$

A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND HUNGARIAN GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE

by

ROBERT A. OROSZ, Ph. D.

Final Report For

1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4

PREFACE

0.1 The case for contrastive grammars

The case for contrastive grammars based on sound descriptive analyses of the two languages in question has been succintly and effectively stated by Charles A. Ferguson (Stockwell et al. 1965:v.): " ... one of the major problems in the learning of a second language is the interference caused by the structural differences between the native language of the learner and the second language. ... a careful contrastive analysis of the two languages offers an excellent basis for the preparation of instructional materials, the planning of courses, and the development of actual classroom techniques."

In addition to the above uses, such a contrastive grammar can prove useful in itself for advanced students of either language who could improve their control of the second language by getting rid of subconscious "foreignisms" more rapidly and effectively, having had their attention directed to these structural faults. A contrastive grammar may also be of interest to linguists, who may find it convenient to have juxtaposed analyses of the given languages, for example, in the search for linguistic universals. Finally, I might state my agreement with the opinion that contrastive studies "are viable objectives for their own sake." (Stockwell 1968:25.)

0.2 Purpose and scope of this study

The purpose of this study is to contrast from the structural linguistic point of view those areas of English and Hungarian grammar which in my view are most likely to cause the greatest

interference for the native English speaker learning Hungarian.
Since the development of contrastive grammars as such is in its
infancy, there are as yet no quantitative measures that can be
applied to the grammars of two given languages to determine
those differences of structure in which the greatest likelihood
of interference would arise. The choice of topics here has, ac-
cordingly, been based, for the most part, on personal observa-
tion, both of English speakers learning Hungarian and of Hungar-
ian native speakers speaking English, and on a study of grammars
of various kinds, both in English and Hungarian. Since a "com-
plete" grammar of any language would be virtually impossible--
from the practical--and, possibly, even the linguistic--point
of view, this study will be limited in scope, treating selected
areas, primarily of syntax, and secondarily of morphology. (For
a contrastive study of English and Hungarian phonology see Nem-
ser and Juhasz 1964.)

0.3 The approach taken in this study

The approach taken in this study is essentially taxonomic.
However, there are also several statements of the transforma-
tional-generative type made here, but only of the most informal
variety. Strict limitations on space precluded the insertion
of more formal generative statements, and also the inclusion of
a greater number of "intermediate" stages of some of the struc-
tures discussed here. The examples for both of the languages
treated are given in the traditional orthographies. However,
since this work is not intended for use by beginning students
of either English or Hungarian, the number of examples is kept
at the minimum necessary for the proper illustration of the

given principle being analyzed. Moreover, spacial limitations also preclude giving overt "hints to the teacher" or a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss of each example, although such devices would undoubtedly be of practical value for some readers. It is assumed, however, that the examples as given, translated, and discussed here will serve their intended purpose of illustration.

0.4 Acknowledgements

The English corpus represents, first of all, my own speech, a spoken variety of standard "mid-Western American," supplemented by the opinions of other native speakers of more or less the same variety of American English. Unfortunately, no native speaker of British English was available to me at the most crucial stages of the preparation of this study; consequently, interesting aspects of that variety of English had to be left out of consideration. Published studies were also used as sources for some of the English material used. Direct quotations from these works are indicated in the footnotes, and my gratitude to these authors, if not noted elsewhere, is hereby acknowledged, as is my gratitude to those native speakers of American English, too numerous to list, who have at one time or other been kind enough to answer questions relating to usage. Special thanks are due Kathleen Fenton and Cathy Orosz for graciously taking time out from busy schedules to answer some of my queries. I have also profited from several linguistic discussions held with Rex Moser and with Craig Goodrich.

The uncited Hungarian material used for this study was collected partly during the course of a three-year program of Hungarian studies at Indiana University made possible through NDEA

12

Foreign Language Fellowships, partly during a six-month stay in Hungary which was financed by a grant from the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants, and partly during the period of this contract with the United States Office of Education. I wish to thank all of the organizations involved as well as Professor Thomas A. Sebeok, who very kindly made available to me the facilities of the Indiana University Research Center for the Language Sciences.

For assistance in certain matters pertaining to usage in Hungarian I am indebted to Professor Gustav Bayerle and Dr. Andrew Vázsonyi of Indiana University, and to my regular native informant here in the U.S., Mr. László Kovács. For help during my stay in Hungary I am especially indebted to Dr. János Zsilka, Dr. József Erdődi, Mr. Gábor Vigh, and other individuals who offered advice--often unsolicited--in matters pertaining to the Hungarian language.

Professors Alo Raun and Fred Householder of Indiana University offered valuable suggestions in regard to some of the material presented in this study, in particular Part II, which was submitted as a doctoral dissertation to the faculty of the Graduate School of Indiana University and accepted in partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Linguistics.

Many useful suggestions were also offered by Professor Carleton Hodge, to whom I owe an especial debt of gratitude, for without his kind efforts this project would not have been initiated.

Needless to say, any deficiencies in this work are my sole responsibility.

13

-4-

Édes szüleim emlékének

14

PART ONE: ARTICLE USAGE

In foreign-language textbooks written in English it seems traditional to begin the section on "grammar" with the presentation of the equivalents of the English definite article, if such exists in the language studied. This practice is pedagogically understandable when one considers the high frequency of the articles in a running text of English. One would, accordingly, expect an English-speaking student of a foreign language to feel an immediate need to know what the translation equivalents of the articles are in the language being studied, inasmuch as he is immediately called on to produce the equivalent of "I am a student," or "Miss Smith is the teacher," and the like.

There is a correspondingly strong motivation for beginning a contrastive grammar such as this with a detailed discussion of the different articles and their uses, especially when one of the languages being analyzed is Hungarian, a language in which the articles play just as important a role as the articles in English. In Hungarian, moreover, article selection is not only syntactically important in itself, as in English, but also has a direct bearing on the selection of either of two main conjugation types.

Structurally speaking, there are three articles (with several allomorphic variants) in Hungarian, and three--possibly four--in English, also with several variants each. The articles in English are the, a/an, ∅, (and possibly no); for Hungarian a/az, egy. In this work English the and Hungarian az will represent all forms of the "definite article," and English a and Hungarian egy all forms of the respective "indefinite article,"

15

regardless of the particular variant present in the given examples. The third article to be discussed extensively in this section is ∅, which, since it has no phonemic value nor graphemic representation, is generally ignored in traditional grammars of either language. In modern linguistic literature ∅ is called the "zero determiner" or simple "zero." In this study "zero article" will be used as a parallel term to "definite" and "indefinite articles," and in free variation with the preceding labels.

CHAPTER I

THE DEFINITE ARTICLE

The uses of the definite article in English and Hungarian
seem at first glance to be so similar that it may be safe to as-
sume that interference can be caused by this very fact alone.
The principle of least effort could understandably lead a begin-
ning English-speaking student to use the Hungarian articles
everywhere in the same fashion as the English ones as soon as
he discovers that their basic "meanings" are quite similar.
Any significant divergence in usage may escape his notice until
special effort is made on his part to scrutinize the differ-
ences whenever they occur in the structures being studied. A
survey such as the following might result from such a scrutiny.

1.1 The definite article to indicate "previous mention"

Perhaps the principal use of the definite article in both
languages is to mark a noun as having been previously identi-
fied. This identification may stem from previous mention in
the discourse or from the situation in which the discourse is
taking place. Thus, the definite article signals the fact that
the noun it appears with is the "same" noun that was just men-
tioned in prior discourse:

> a. 1. I met an interesting man yesterday. The man ...
>   2. Egy érdekes férfit ismertem meg tegnap.
>   A férfi ...

In these typical discourse situations we have an example of the
indefinite article in each language being used to mark the intro-
duction of a noun into a discourse, and the subsequent use of
the definite article to mark the noun as having been previously

identified. In fact, it could by convention be considered "un-grammatical" to continue the discourse in either language using the indefinite article in the second sentence if the speaker ex-pects the hearer to understand that the identical man is meant in both occurrences of the noun.

1.1.1 <u>Partial</u> <u>subsequent</u> <u>reference</u>. If a noun introduced into a discourse by an indefinite determiner has a plural or collective referent, the subsequent occurrence of the definite noun may vary in patterning in either language, depending on whether <u>all</u> or <u>part</u> of the entities underlying the antecedent are subsequently being referred to. This factor, namely total vs. partial reference, has extensive structural ramifications in several areas of syntax in both Hungarian and English--and will be treated in detail in Part II of this study. In this section we will deal with the effect this factor has on the use of the articles. It is well known that a singular noun phrase, once having been mentioned, may be marked by the defi-nite article in English and also by the fact that such a defi-nite noun phrase may be followed by non-restrictive modifica-tion only, such as a clause, as in the following example:

    a. 1. I met an interesting man yesterday.[1]
       2. The man, who was very intelligent, told me
          many interesting things.
       3. *The man who was very intelligent told me many
          interesting things.

Since there is only one entity underlying the antecedent of <u>the</u> <u>man</u> in a.2, the reference here must necessarily be total. If, on the other hand, there is a plural or collective antecedent involved, the subsequent reference may be total or partial. If total in reference, the definite noun phrase may be followed by

non-restrictive modification; if partial, then a new noun phrase

must be formed by adding the necessary restrictive modification

to the definite noun:

	b.	1.	I met a group of men yesterday.
(all)		2.	The men, who were intelligent, were very interesting.
(some)		3.	The men who were intelligent were very interesting.

In Hungarian there seems to be no regular phonemic difference

between restrictive clause types. Accordingly, the above sort

of distinction must be made elsewhere in the sentence. This is

usually done by the employment of a different determiner, as is

shown in the following translations of the sentences in b.

	c.	1.	Egy csoport férfit ismertem meg tegnap.
(all)		2.	A férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek is voltak.
(some)		3.	Azok a férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek is voltak.

It goes without saying that other types of restrictive modifi-

cation may also be employed when only part of the original group

is being referred to subsequently, for example, stressed pre-

posed adjectives:

| | d. | 1. | The _intelligent_ men were interesting. |
| | | 2. | Az _intelligens_ férfiak érdekesek is voltak. |

Except for the fact that predicate adjectives are declined for

number in Hungarian, the various modifications possible as al-

ternates for those shown in b. and c. above match quite closely

from one language to the next.

1.2 The _definite_ _article_ _to_ _indicate_ "_situational_ _identifica-_
       tion"

It will be readily understood that often the identifica-

tion needed for definitizing a noun may actually come through

tacit agreement rather than overt discourse, for in countless instances in human affairs the situation itself in which the discourse is taking place provides sufficient identification for both the speaker and hearer to understand what the "real world" referent of the particular noun is. Thus we can say:

a. 1. Please close the window.
   2. Tessék az ablakot becsukni.

b. 1. Please close the door.
   2. Zárja be az ajtót, kérem.

without having to say overtly something to the effect that there is an open window near the hearer, or that the door to the room is open. As these examples show, this applies to the Hungarian situation as well as to the English. The situation in which a noun may thus be tacitly identified may range from rather narrow confines, as, for example, the room in which the discourse is taking place--as in the examples in the preceding paragraph--to the whole world of human comprehension.

1.2.1 <u>Contrasts</u> <u>in</u> <u>situational</u> <u>identification</u>. While the two languages being discussed here generally agree in the use of the definite article with situationally-identified common nouns, there are naturally areas of contrast in this broad area. One such point of contrast lies in the interpretation of the status of the names of the days of the week and of the months. These of course are treated as proper nouns in English, both as to orthography and syntax, but as common nouns in Hungarian with the definite article being optional:

a. 1. Tuesday isn't suitable for me.
   2. (<u>A</u>) kedd nem alkalmas nekem.

b. 1. Where did March go?
   2. Hova ment (<u>a</u>) március?

When modified, such names in English are reduced to ordinary
common nouns capable of collocating with either definite or in-
definite determiners: <u>on</u> <u>a</u> <u>beautiful</u> <u>Sunday</u>, <u>on</u> <u>the</u> <u>following</u>
<u>Tuesday</u>, which parallels <u>on</u> <u>a</u> <u>cold</u> <u>day</u> and <u>on</u> <u>the</u> <u>following</u> <u>day</u>.

1.2.2 <u>Proximity</u>. The above-mentioned notion of "situation-
al identification" has in it some notion of "proximity," primar-
ily spacial in English, both spacial or temporal in Hungarian.
Thus, while the definite article in both languages is used to
indicate "the ___ near you," e.g., "window" and "door" in 1.2
above, the same article in Hungarian may indicate some "time
near us," for example, <u>az</u> <u>aste</u> 'last night', <u>a</u> <u>héten</u> 'this week,'
<u>a</u> <u>napokban</u>, lit. 'in the days' = 'recently,' etc. English fol-
lows this usage somewhat inconsistently, unless one can say that
<u>the</u> <u>past</u>, <u>the</u> <u>present</u>, and <u>the</u> <u>future</u> are equally "proximate"
in the minds of mortal English speakers. With the names of the
seasons, however, the definite article does seem to convey the
idea of proximity in English for some speakers. The contrast
between a.1 and a.2 below is one of differentiating between
"every spring" in a.1 and "the coming spring" in the other sen-
tence:

a. 1. In <u>spring</u> we move to Missesota.
   2. In <u>the</u> <u>spring</u> we move to Minnesota.

The Hungarian equivalents can make the same type of semantic
distinction by the use of different auxiliary verbs:

b. 1. Tavasszal Minnisotába <u>szoktunk</u> költözni.
      (i.e. "usually")
   2. Tavasszal Minnisotába <u>fogunk</u> költözni.
      ('will')

1.2.3 <u>Concurrent</u> <u>identification</u>. We may finish this sec-
tion of our discussion on the uses of the definite article by

mentioning an obvious, but important fact: "previous mention"
is very often actually "concurrent mention," that is, the iden-
tification of the noun phrase may occur in the same sentence as
the noun phrase in question:

> a. 1. The story I am about to tell ...
>   2. A történet, amelyet most elmesélek ...

More will be said of this phenomenon in the discussion of defi-
niteness in Chapter IV.

1.3 The definite article as a "generic article"

The definite article in both languages can be used with a
noun taken in the generic sense. This may be considered to be
a type of "situational identification." When the generic noun
is a count-noun and is employed in a definitional sentence, the
generic article usage is the same:

> a. 1. The whale is a mammal.
>   2. A bálna emlősállat.

However, if the nouns in question are non-count nouns, zero is
used in English, while the Hungarian article is the same:

> b. 1. Sugar is a popular flavoring.
>   2. A cukor népszerű ízesítő.
>
> c. 1. Gold is a precious metal.
>   2. Az arany nemesfém.
>
> d. 1. Patience is a virtue.
>   2. A türelmesség erény.

The noun man used generically also appears with zero in English,
while its Hungarian equivalent has the expected definite article:

> e. 1. Man is also a mammal.
>   2. Az ember is emlősállat.

1.3.1 Other generic articles in English. The is not the
only article which is used with generic count-nouns in English
definitional sentences. The indefinite article, as well as

zero with plural nouns may be so used, while Hungarian uses only
az. Thus, the three English sentences below are all generic
statements and have only one acceptable Hungarian equivalent:

    a. 1. The whale is a mammal.
       2. A whale is a mammal.
       3. Whales are mammals.

    b. 1. A bálna emlősállat.
       2. *Egy bálna emlősállat.
       3. *Bálnák emlősállatok.

    1.3.2 <u>Generics</u> <u>in</u> <u>non-definitional</u> <u>sentences</u>. When a ge-
nerically used noun occurs in a non-definitional sentence, ar-
ticle usage may vary from that above. In a sentence such as
a.1 below, for example, <u>the</u> + noun cannot be used to convey the
same general non-contrastive meaning, while in Hungarian the
generic noun may occur in the plural, but again with the definite
article:

       a. 1. I don't like cats.   (*the cat(s))
         2. Nem szeretem a macskát.   (sg.)
or: 3. Nem szeretem a macskákat. (pl.)

The generic pattern of the English noun phrase in a.1 coincides
with the pattern of non-count nouns occurring either in a gener-
ic or partitive sense. In Hungarian these uses are kept sepa-
rate, the definite article occurring in the first instance, zero
in the second:

    b. 1. I like coffee.   (generic)
       2. Szeretem a kávét.

    c. 1. I'd like coffee.   (non-generic)
       2. Kávét szeretnék.

The contrasting uses of the different sets of conjugational end-
ings in Hungarian will be discussed in Part II of this study.

23

1.4 The definite article in possessive constructions

The use of the definite article in possessive constructions in both languages shows several structural parallelisms, but many divergencies as well.[2] When the possessor noun, for example, appears as an overt part of the possessive construction, the possibilities in both languages are varied. Both Hungarian and English may have two, one, or no occurrences of the definite article, there being, of course, no one-to-one correspondence between the uses of articles and all other structural factors involved in the possessive construction.

1.4.1 Definite common noun as possessor.

When the possessor is a common noun made definite through previous mention or through situational identification, both languages agree in the use of the definite article before the possessor if the possessor is animate, the possessed being obligatorily preceded by $\emptyset$ in English, while the corresponding Hungarian may have $\emptyset$ or az:

  a. 1. a fiú könyve
    2. the boy's book

If the possessor is inanimate, the Hungarian construction remains the same, while the English one generally varies:

  b. 1. a ház teteje
    2. the roof of the house (*the house's roof)

The definite article in Hungarian is required between the possessor noun and the possessed if the former has the genitive suffix -nak:[3]

  c. 1. a fiúnak a könyve
    2. the boy's book

  d. 1. a háznak a teteje
    2. the roof of the house

While the two variants of the possessive construction in Hungarian are optional, showing only a slight difference in emphasis in the latter form, the distinction in English between animate and inanimate possessive patterns is fairly strictly upheld except for a number of temporal nouns: e.g., a week's wages, and a limited number of common nouns sometimes felt to have proper noun status: the earth's rotation, the sun's rays (also: the rotation of the earth, the rays of the sun,) etc.

1.4.2 Proper noun as possessor. When the possessor is a proper noun, both languages may have the zero article before the possessor and before the possessed:

a. 1. János könyve
   2. John's book (*the book of John)

However, with the possibility of using the definite article before a proper noun in colloquial Hungarian, two more constructions are possible:

b. 1. (a) János könyve
   2. (b) Jánosnak a könyve

All four variants have the same English equivalents in written form, stress placement being used to make any necessary distinctions of emphasis in speech.

1.4.3 Possessive constructions without a noun. When no noun is overtly present in the possessive construction, English uses the so-called genitive articles (possessive adjectives) to show the possessor-possessed relationship while Hungarian still employs possessive suffixes, but now with the addition of the definite article before the noun so marked:

a. 1. a kalapom
   2. my hat

b. 1. <u>a</u> kalapod, etc.
   2. <u>your</u> hat, etc.

In fact the use of the article in this type of structure is more or less obligatory in spoken Hungarian, although it is optional in written styles, especially in sentence-initial position.

1.4.4 <u>Emphatic possessive constructions without a noun</u>.
If the possessor is emphasized in a Hungarian construction in which the possessor noun is not overtly present, then the personal pronoun together with the definite article is employed before the possessed, while the emphasis in the corresponding English construction is usually achieved by stress placement alone:

a. 1. <u>az</u> <u>én</u> kalapom, <u>a</u> <u>te</u> kalapod, etc.
   2. <u>my</u> hat, <u>your</u> hat, etc.

The definite article is likewise used before the possessive pronoun in Hungarian:

b. 1. <u>az</u> <u>én</u> kalapom, nem <u>a</u> <u>tied</u>
   2. <u>my</u> hat, not <u>yours</u>

1.4.5 <u>Definite article as a "possessive" in English</u>. In addition to the article usage mentioned above, English uses the definite article <u>instead</u> <u>of</u> the genitive article in certain constructions of a limited type, while the Hungarian equivalent generally retains the basic possessive pattern (particularly if the thing "possessed" is emphasized) with the definite article most often present. The latter construction in English may, I believe, also be analyzed as a (restricted) subcategory of the use of the definite article with a situationally identified noun, for in such sentences as the following the possessor of the body part is clearly understood from the immediate context:

26

a. 1. He has a pain in <u>the</u> stomach. (also: His stom-
ach hurts.)
2. Fáj a gyomra.

b. 1. He was foaming at <u>the</u> mouth.
2. Habzott a szája.

That this is a structurally limited use of the English article
is clear, but it is, nonetheless, an important aspect of accept-
ed usage at all levels. While the equivalent construction in
Hungarian calls for the use of the possessive noun in most cases--
with or without the definite article--the use of the English
"possessive" pattern being discussed here seems to rely on the
fulfillment of two conditions: 1) the possessor of the body
part (or article of clothing) is overtly expressed in the sen-
tence, and 2) the possessed part or object is generally the ob-
ject of a preposition. Therefore we can have:

a. 1. John scratched himself on <u>the</u> arm.
but not: 2. *John scratched himself on <u>his</u> arm.

b. 1. The apple hit him on <u>the</u> head.
but not: 2. *The apple hit him on <u>his</u> head.

We must also have:

c. 1. John raised <u>his</u> arm.
and not: 2. *John raised <u>the</u> arm.

also: d. 1. The apple fell on <u>his</u> head.
and not: 2. *The apple fell on <u>the</u> head.

if we mean that these particular body parts are on John and not
detached. In short, then, if either of the above conditions has
not been met, then the definite article is usually not used in
this fashion. However, there is an exceptional pattern here
which indicates "the part of a part" as in "<u>the</u> hair of his
head," "the nail of/on his big toe," etc. Here only condition
1) is met.

27

1.5 The definite article with proper names

Although much more will be said in subsequent chapters on the use of various articles with proper nouns, it may be useful at this point to point out that the definite article in both English and Hungarian may collocate with proper nouns in at least two circumstances: 1) as an integral part of the name, or 2) as a non-contrastive (often optional) marker of a qualified proper noun. In addition, Hungarian personal names, both first names and full names, can be preceded by an optional definite article. We shall discuss circumstance 1) here, and defer the discussion of 2) until Chapter VII.

1.5.1 The article as a regular part of the name. English and Hungarian generally agree on the use of the definite article in names for geographical entities except that Hungarian is consistent in using the articles for all bodies of water, names of mountains, and heavenly bodies, while English makes an exception for the names of lakes, individual peaks, and the names of the planets. Thus we have, for example:

az Atlanti-óceán	the Atlantic (Ocean)
a Duna	the Danube (River)
but: a Balaton	Lake Balaton

It can be seen from the first two English examples above that the definite article with the name of the ocean or river name is usually sufficient as an unambiguous designation of the body of water in question. In such cases the may contrast directly with zero:

a. 1. I don't like the Mississippi.
2. I don't like Mississippi. (the state)

We also have:

```
az Alpok                      the Alps
but: a Gellért Hegy           Gellert Hill (but:  the Matterhorn)

and  a Föld (also a föld)     the Earth (also Earth and the
                                                        earth)
but: a Vénus, a Mars, etc.    Venus, Mars, etc.
```

1.5.2 Interlingual contrasts in article usage with proper
nouns. Interlingual contrasts in article usage may be slightly
more haphazard than the types listed in the preceding section,
for discrepancies in the matching of articles can occur through
intra-lingual optional usage or through competing forms. Thus
in addition to the first two "lexical mismatches" given below,
there are optional variants in one language not matched by paral-
lel variants in the other language:

```
a Nagy-Britannia             Great Britain
Hága                         the Hague (also The Hague)
Argentína                    Argentina/the Argentine
az Egyesült Államok          the United States (United States,
                                  these United States)
```

The definite article may optionally occur before unqualified
personal names in colloquial Hungarian:

```
(a) János                    John
(a) Kovács Pista             Steve Smith
(a) Zsuzsi                   Susie
```

while qualified personal names are regularily preceded by the
definite article, optionally in English:

```
a kis Zsuzsi                 little Susie
a hallgatag Kovács Pista     (the) silent Steve Smith
```

More on the modification of proper names will be found in Chap-
ter VII.

1.6 Other uses of the definite article

There are other marginal (or miscellaneous) uses of the
definite article in either language which have no counterparts
in the other language. Some of these constructions may be

classified as unanalyzable idioms, while others are productive, though statistically minor, constructions.

1.6.1 **The** **definite** **article** **in** **English** **as** **part** **of** **a** **correlative** **conjunction.** In English the definite article may occur in pairs with the comparative to form a correlative conjunction connecting the condition and result of an action. This is a type of "if ... then" relationship:

a. 1. <u>the</u> taller <u>the</u> better
    2. minél magasabb, annál jobb

b. 1. <u>The</u> more he talked, <u>the</u> stupider he sounded.
    2. Minél többet beszélt, annál butábbnak hallatszott.

1.6.2. **The** **article** **with** **cited** **forms.** Words cited as linguistic units must have the article in Hungarian, often in conjunction with the word <u>szó</u> 'word' or a compound of it. In English, on the other hand, the word may readily appear isolated:

a. 1. a "hogy" kötőszó
    2. the conjunction "hogy" (or, with different juncture: "<u>hogy</u>" <u>is</u> <u>a</u> <u>conjunction</u>)

b. 1. a szó "hogy" kötőszó
    2. "hogy" is a conjunction (or <u>the</u> <u>word</u> "hogy" <u>is</u> <u>a</u> <u>conjunction</u>)

c. 1. a "who" kérdő névmás
    2. <u>the</u> interrogative pronoun "who" (or "<u>who</u>" <u>is</u> <u>an</u> <u>interrogative</u> <u>pronoun</u>)

1.6.3 **The** **definite** **article** **as** **part** **of** **an** **idiom.** There are in English and Hungarian many expressions, acting as one lexical unit--though composed of more than one word--which, as such, are not analyzable into smaller meaningful units, but must be treated as wholes. As these idioms must necessarily be translated by similar or parallel whole <u>semantic</u> items, there may or may not

be agreement as to occurrence of any given type of constituent,
including, of course, the definite article. The following is a
sample list of English idiomatic expressions in which the defi-
nite article is found. A possible Hungarian equivalent is given,
the presence or absence of the definite article being governed
by pure chance. The list could quite easily be expanded to mono-
graph proportions:[5]

      a. 1. at the time
        2. akkor (also: abban az időben)

      b. 1. in the know
        2. jól értesült

      c. 1. in the open
        2. a szabad ég alatt

      d. 1. gild the lily
        2. a szépet szebbé tenni

      e. 1. kick the bucket
        2. beadja a kulcsot

      f. 1. be all the rage
        2. ez a legujabb divat

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1.   The convention of setting off non-restrictive clauses by commas to reflect the phonemic open juncture of speech will be followed here, as will the practice of marking unacceptable constructions with an asterisk (*).

2.   See footnote 1 of Chapter IX for the structural definition of possessive construction as used here.

3.   For the sake of simplicity I have chosen to give the back vowel variant of those suffixes which have vowel harmonic variants. Statements regarding the uses of a suffix, therefore, are to be understood to include all allomorphs, unless stated otherwise.

4.   There are, however, several fixed expressions involving the designation of some part of the body which do not employ the possessive suffixes in Hungarian, and which usually occur without the definite article before the noun involved: fejbe vágni/kólint 'hit (someone) in the face,' arcon/pofon vágni 'slap (someone) in the face,' fülig 'up to the ear(s),' nyakig 'up to the neck,' etc. These Hungarian expressions, like their English counterparts, are quite frequent.

5.   In addition to the many idioms found throughout the Országh dictionaries listed in the bibliography, there are several longer lists of English idioms with Hungarian equivalents available in print. See, for example, Kundt 1957 and Magay and Lukácsné 1966 and the bibliography given in the latter (p.5). These are miscellaneous lists of idioms, but it is remarkable how many of the idioms listed in the two named works contain at least one occurrence of the definite article in English at least.

CHAPTER II

THE INDEFINITE ARTICLE

2.0 Introduction

After the above rather lengthy discussion on the uses of the definite article in English and Hungarian, an analysis of the constructions with the indefinite article could almost be conducted by the process of elimination were it not for the existence of the zero article and of several co-occurrence restrictions to be explicated below. Therefore, the temptation to oversimplify by holding to a strict dichotomy of definite-indefinite, that is, maintaining that whatever structure is not definite is then indefinite, must be overcome, and each structure must be viewed in its own context. It is only then that the full relationships between different structures can be noted. With these admonitions in mind, we may now proceed to a fuller examination of various occurrences of $\emptyset$ in Chapter III, although no matter which article is being discussed at one given time, each article must in effect be compared or contrasted to each of the others at more than one place.

2.1 The introductory use of the indefinite article

In both languages the indefinite article is employed to introduce a singular, countable noun phrase which has not been previously mentioned in the prior discourse or which is not situationally identifiable:

a. 1. Egy kocsi elakadt.
   2. A car broke down.

b. 1. A padon alszik egy ember.
   2. A man is sleeping on the bench.

As is well known, and as was indicated in 1.1 above, the indefinite article is, in a manner of speaking, ephemeral with a given noun phrase in a discourse, for, once having been used to introduce that noun phrase, it is subsequently replaced by the definite article or another definite determiner when further reference is made to the identical noun phrase in the same discourse.

2.1.1 Alternates for introductory indefinite article.

While the introductory use of the indefinite article in both languages seems to follow the very same pattern, it is not surprising to find that structural differences begin to emerge after only a minimum of further analysis. One area of difference lies in the type of determiner capable of replacing or alternating with the introductory indefinite article while preserving a maximum of the semantic features of the latter. If we consider the general "meaning" of the indefinite articles $\underline{a}$ and $\underline{egy}$ to be "unidentified individual" (of a certain class), then we can obviously postulate at least the minimum of two semantic features, namely "indefiniteness" and "singularity" and use these as a frame for testing the substitutability of other determiners.

2.1.1.1 Indefinite determiners.

To preserve or emphasize the feature of indefiniteness, both languages have recourse to a limited number of "indefinite" determiners which may be used in introductory situations in a discourse. These indefinite determiners may be categorized in close parallel to the two principal uses of the common indefinite articles $\underline{a}$ and $\underline{egy}$, that is, the designation by the article may be of 1) a particular, but

unidentified, member of a class, or 2) any member of that class.

Examples of sentences containing an indefinite article of type

1) are:

  a. 1. <u>A</u> man was sitting on the bench.
     2. <u>Egy</u> ember ült a padon.

  b. 1. <u>A</u> teacher told me where to go.
     2. <u>Egy</u> tanár adta meg az útirányt.

These articles may be replaced, for example, by:

  c. 1. <u>Some</u> man was sitting ...
     2. <u>Valamilyen</u> ember ült ...

or reinforced, for example, by:

  d. 1. <u>A certain</u> teacher ...
     2. <u>Egy bizonyos</u> tanár ...

More will be said about usage 2) in 2.1.2 below. Accordingly,

it need only be mentioned at this point that this English <u>a</u>

may be replaced by <u>any</u>, while in Hungarian the definite article

may play an important role in such a construction which may be

construed as generic:

  e. 1. <u>A</u> teacher shouldn't say such a thing. (i.e., <u>any</u>;
                                                        *<u>the</u>)
     2. <u>Egy</u> tanár nem mondhat ilyesmit.
or   3. <u>A</u> tanár nem mondhat ilyesmit.

also: f. 1. <u>Teachers</u> shouldn't say such a thing.
           2. <u>A tanárok</u> nem mondhatnak ilyesmit.

The noun phrases <u>a</u> teacher and <u>the</u> teachers are quite obviously

generic in some sense since they represent the whole class of

teachers; consequently the Hungarian equivalents may contain the

more common generic article <u>az</u>, as shown in e.3 and f.2, and as

will be discussed in the following section.

  2.1.2 <u>Indefinite article with nouns used generically.</u>

Both <u>a</u> in English and <u>egy</u> in Hungarian may be employed as "gener-

ic" articles in certain instances. The English indefinite

article, however, is employed much more extensively in such constructions than is _egy_, which is limited to optional use in "situational generic" uses as indicated below.

2.1.2.1 "_Situational generic_" _usage_. English _a_ and Hungarian _egy_ are employed in "situational generic" cases where the noun phrase in question is indeed generic, that is, it represents the whole of its class, but reference is made to it in a specific situation. In terms of semantic features one may say that only some of the features of the noun phrase are considered pertinent to the given discourse situation. This is in contrast to "definitional generic" uses where all of the semantic features are being taken into consideration. The following examples are typical:

    a. 1. Szegény volt mint _egy_ koldus.
       2. He was poor as _a_ beggar.

    b. 1. Úgy áll a helyén, mint _egy_ (or _a_) szikla.
       2. He's standing in his place like _a_ rock.

    c. 1. _Egy_ (or _a_) tanár nem mondhat ilyet.
       2. _A_ teacher shouldn't say such a thing.

As mentioned above, Hungarian may optionally use the definite article in such instances since the noun is taken in its generic sense. English, on the other hand, does not employ generic _the_ in these cases, although, as we have seen, _a_ and _the_ may alternate in other generic uses, i.e., the definitional uses.

2.1.2.2 _Definitional generic usage_. In contrast to the situational generic use outlined above, there is another use of the English indefinite article which may be labelled here the "definitional generic" usage in which the definite generic article may also occur as an alternate. In such cases the

Hungarian uses only the definite article. An example of such a generic use of the indefinite article was given above in section 1.3.1:

> a. 1. A whale is a mammal.

which was shown to have two alternates in English, but only one acceptable equivalent in Hungarian:

> b. 1. The whale is a mammal.
> 2. Whales are mammals.
> 3. A bálna emlős(állat).

To complete this discussion of generic articles, it may be of interest to point out that while a covers all situational generic uses and only part of the definitional generic uses of the articles in English, there are also instances where a does not occur as a generic article if the noun in question is being stressed in its totality. This may be illustrated in the following sentences:

> c. 1. Who invented the telephone?   (*a)
> 2. Modern man exterminated the dodo. (*a)

The Hungarian equivalent, of course, would contain the usual definite article as the generic article.

2.2 Other uses of the indefinite article with common nouns

The above discussion on the uses of the indefinite article in English and Hungarian covers the majority of cases where the two languages exploit the articles most fully, and where, coincidentally, the two languages most agree. There remain for discussion usages which may be called "minor," or types of usage in which the two languages diverge in structure to such an extent that the term "idiom" is appropriate. We will begin this part of our discussion with perhaps the most outstanding example of interlingual divergence in indefinite article usage, namely that

of identification of class-membership in equational sentences.

2.2.1 _Indefinite article to mark class-membership_. As is well known, English, unlike many Indo-European languages, uses the indefinite article to identify the class to which a given entity belongs. In English this use of the article is obligatory whether or not the predicate noun in such an equational sentence is restricted or modified in any way. Standard Hungarian, on the other hand, follows the more prevalent Indo-European usage in leaving the predicate noun unmarked, or marked with zero in our discussion here, unless the noun is modified. The following examples may serve to illustrate this type of construction:

a. 1. The (A) sparrow is a bird.
   2. A veréb madár.

b. 1. My son is a doctor.
   2. A fiam orvos.

c. 1. John is a Catholic.
   2. János katolikus.

d. 1. That's a lie.
   2. Az hazugság.

e. 1. His friend is an American.
   2. A barátja amerikai.

In more informal Hungarian, however, one can find _egy_ being used in much the same way as _a_ of the English examples, this usage being labelled "fölöslegesen használva" ('redundant') in the _Értelmező Szótár_ (Vol. II, p.38a.). The following sentences, then, are possible variants for the Hungarian examples immediately above:

f. 1. A veréb _egy_ madár.
   2. A fiam _egy_ orvos.
   3. János _egy_ katolikus.
   4. Az _egy_ hazugság.
   5. A baratja _egy_ amerikai.

2.2.1.1 <u>Indefinite article with qualified predicate nouns.</u>
When the predicate noun in an equational sentence is qualified,
both languages agree in the use of the indefinite article. In
this case, however, Hungarian has an optional construction with
zero. So while Hungarian has zero as the rule before unmodified
predicate nouns, as outlined in 2.2.1 above, and <u>egy</u> as an op-
tion, here <u>egy</u> is the general rule and zero the option:

    a. 1. A veréb (<u>egy</u>) kis madár.
       2. The sparrow is <u>a</u> small bird.

    b. 1. A fiam (<u>egy</u>) híres orvos.
       2. My son is <u>a</u> famous doctor.

2.2.1.2 <u>Emphatic qualified nouns with the indefinite ar-
ticle.</u> If a qualified noun with the indefinite article in Hun-
garian becomes a constituent of an emphatic sentence, then the
qualifier may stand before the article. The corresponding En-
glish construction usually contains an intensifier before the
article, which still precedes the original qualifier:

    a. 1. Derék <u>egy</u> ember ez a Pista!
       2. This Steve is such <u>a</u> nice person.
            (What a nice person this Steve is!)

    b. 1. Ostoba <u>egy</u> gyerek!
       2. Such <u>a</u> stupid child!

2.2.2 <u>Indefinite article with expressions of time.</u> Time
expressions, which, as is well known, usually border on idiom,
often contain occurrences of the indefinite in either language.
Rather than present an exhaustive list of time expressions here,
I believe it will serve a useful purpose merely to outline the
types of construction in which the indefinite article may be em-
ployed in at least one of the languages being analyzed here. A
more detailed discussion of time and tense will be presented in
Chapter XVI.

2.2.2.1 The indefinite article with general expressions of time. In time expressions dealing with general designations of duration, as contrasted with countable units of time, both languages agree in the basic use of the indefinite article:

egy ideig   for a time
egy darabig   for a while

2.2.2.2 The Hungarian article with other time units. In cases where time expressions contain a measurable or countable unit, Hungarian may still employ the indefinite article before the time-designating element. Alternate usage (in addition to the best translation in English, as given here) seems to indicate that the article used in the Hungarian expressions displays the feature of singularity in this instance over the feature of indefiniteness. Thus the examples:

egy délután   one afternoon
egy vasárnap   one Sunday

may be replaced by

egyik délután   one afternoon
egyik vasárnap   one Sunday

particularly when the total number of such time units (out of which the particular entity has been selected for discussion) is known or understood in the discourse. The following example is illustrative (Értelmező Szótár II:50b.):

a. 1. Két hétig nyaraltam a Balatonon: egyik délután
       nagy vihar volt.
   2. I spent two weeks on vacation on Lake Balaton.
      One afternoon there was a big storm.

2.3 The indefinite article used with a proper noun

We have seen in paragraph 1.5.2 that proper nouns in English may, under certain conditions, take a definite article which is not a permanent part of the name. This fact already

shows that a characterization of proper nouns such as that given
by Bloomfield: "Names (proper nouns) occur only in the singular
number, take no determiner, and are always definite: <u>John</u>, <u>Chi-</u>
<u>cago</u>" is inadequate on at least one account, namely that of non-
occurrence with a determiner. In this section we shall see that
the <u>indefinite</u> article may also occur with proper names, there-
by invalidating the last portion of the above statement by Bloom-
field. Although in Chapter VI we will discuss in detail the
status of proper nouns in the category of definiteness, it may
prove useful, by way of introduction, to discuss at least the
following in regard to proper nouns and indefinite determiners.
To begin our discussion, it is necessary to state, however, as
Bloomfield himself does, that what seem to be proper nouns may,
in effect, be reduced to common nouns in certain instances, and
consequently may be employed with a preceding determiner, defi-
nite or indefinite. This point of view must be taken when one
examines the various semantic differences between a proper noun
with zero and one preceded by an indefinite article. This we
shall do at the end of the following brief survey of some pos-
sible types of indefinite article and proper noun constructions.

2.3.1 <u>Proper noun as</u> "<u>person named X</u>." The indefinite ar-
ticle may precede a proper noun which has more or less the mean-
ing "a person named ___," diverting attention from the individu-
al to the name as such. In such cases the proper name can no
longer be called "definite." There are, in fact, several degrees
of "semantic" indefiniteness which can be achieved by the employ-
ment of various devices in both languages. As can be seen from
the following, however, only English usage allows the employment

of the unaccompanied indefinite article before a proper name.

2.3.1.1 <u>Unaccompanied indefinite article before name</u>. In English the proper noun may be preceded by the indefinite article with no other reinforcing element needed. In Hungarian, on the other hand, the use of the indefinite article is optional, but if present, it must be accompanied by an adjective preceding the name or <u>nevű</u> (or <u>nevezetű</u>) 'named,' after the noun:

        a. 1. a Mr. Kis
            2. egy bizonyos Kis úr
            3. egy Kis nevű/nevezetű úr

2.3.1.2 <u>Emphasis on indefiniteness of name</u>. When a greater degree of indefiniteness is sought with regard to the name of the person being mentioned, both English and Hungarian have recourse to other indefinite determiners or adjectives for use before the name. The most common of these are <u>one</u>, <u>a certain</u>, and <u>some</u> ... <u>or other</u> in English, and <u>bizonyos</u>, <u>valami</u> or <u>valamiféle</u> in Hungarian:

        a. 1. one Mr. Smith
            2. valami Smith úr

        b. 1. a certain Mr. Smith
            2. bizonyos Smith nevű úr

        c. 1. some Colonel Brown or other
            2. valamiféle Brown ezredes

The examples above are not meant to show a one-to-one correspondence between the English and Hungarian forms, but are meant to be illustrative. Furthermore, the English forms given above are used in fairly formal types of conversational style. In more informal styles constructions such as <u>a person named</u> ___, <u>a man named</u> - ___, <u>a boy named</u> ___, etc., are commonly employed. The Hungarian equivalents follow much the same pattern type, although

42

with different word order:

> d. 1. a man named Smith
> 2. egy Smith nevű/nevezetű ember

> e. 1. a boy named John
> 2. egy János nevű/nevezetű fiú

2.3.2 <u>Proper name meaning "having the qualities of X."</u> A proper name in either language may be converted to a common noun with the approximate meaning "a person (or place) having the pertinent qualities of the well-known individual (or place) who (which) originally bore the name." Thus we can have sentences of the type:

> a. 1. A Shakespeare isn't born in every century.
> 2. <u>Egy</u> Shakespeare nem minden században születik.

As with other common nouns in Hungarian, this type of common-noun-from-proper-noun may also occur with ∅ instead of the indefinite article <u>egy</u>, the English equivalent being best rendered by the indefinite article:

> b. 1. Adyt látnak benne. (Tompa 1964:158)
> 2. They see an Ady in him.

In one instance the original English article is fused with the following determiner while the Hungarian equivalent retains the regular features of a qualified indefinite noun-phrase construction:

> c. 1. another Byron
> 2. egy második/új Byron

2.3.3 <u>Optional use of article with modified proper noun.</u> In English one can find the indefinite article optionally used before a proper noun which is modified by a restrictive clause or other modifiers. The construction with the indefinite article may be labelled "marginal" or perhaps "formal," inasmuch as the

less formal conversational styles usually employ the construc-
tion with zero.   In Hungarian zero is the rule except in com-
parisons:

         a. 1. (A) Paris without the Eiffel tower would seem
               incomplete.
            2. Párizs az Eiffel-torony nélkül befejezetlennek
               látszana.

but: b. 1. Egy Párizs nem hasonlítható X-városhoz.
            2. A Paris cannot be compared to X.

   2.3.4 <u>Summary of indefinite article usage with</u> "<u>proper</u>
<u>nouns.</u>" In view of the discussion of the occurrence of the
indefinite article with what seem to be proper nouns, it seems
appropriate to enclose the term "proper noun" in quotation marks
in the heading of this paragraph, for it is quite obvious that
except for the "marginal" English example in 2.3.3, all of the
other "proper nouns" treated here have gone over to the common
noun category, both syntactically and semantically in both lan-
guages.   Such a noun cooccurring with an indefinite article los-
es its status as a proper noun as such, since it is no longer
the individual entity, but the characteristics of the entity
which are brought to the fore in the discourse.   Speaking in
generative terms, we can say that it is the semantic features,
rather than the referent underlying the lexical item carrying
the semantic features, which are being referred to in the dis-
course.   This differs substantially with the construction type
mentioned in 1.5.2, in which the definite article appears be-
fore a proper noun.   In the sentences below, for example, it
can readily be seen that in a.1 a specific television personali-
ty is meant, while in a.2 <u>any</u> individual with the qualities of
the famous personality is needed:

-35-   44

a. 1. Substituting for the vacationing Johnny Carson
is ...
2. What this show needs is a Johnny Carson.

See Part II for further discussion on the definite-indefinite

status of proper nouns.

CHAPTER III

THE ZERO ARTICLE

3.0 Introduction

Inasmuch as the zero article is not composed of any phonic substance or graphemic form, its existence is totally ignored in traditional grammars of either language under study here. However, postulating its existence for the purposes of linguistic analysis often produces a smoother description, providing that care is taken not to abuse its use. Zero must clearly be distinguished from nothing, that is, there must be sufficient structural or paradigmatic justification for positing a syntactic element with no positive phonic value. This justification, I believe, is to be found, for example, in a syntactic paradigm such as:

a table ...	egy asztal ... (or ∅ asztal)
the table ...	az asztal ...
∅ tables ...	∅ asztolok ...

It can be seen here that in English zero contrasts with a and the (and other determiners), while in Hungarian zero contrasts correspondingly with egy and az (and other determiners). On the other hand, beautiful and szép alternate with nothing, that is, with their absence--and not with zero--in such constructions as:

a beautiful table	egy szép asztal
a table	egy asztal

Nothing could occur between any two separable elements in a discourse while the presence of a postulated zero is strictly limited structurally.

46

In view of the foregoing brief introduction to the zero article, it becomes apparent that we have already had many encounters with it in this work, for in a full discussion of both the definite and indefinite articles in either language, it becomes necessary, for the sake of immediate completeness, to contrast their uses with their closest possible structural alternates. It remains for us here, accordingly, to recapitulate the statements already made in regard to the use of zero and to add other statements on usage not specifically treated above.

3.1 The zero article with common nouns

Both languages under study here employ the zero article before common nouns used in varying ways. Some of these types of usage have already been indicated in various paragraphs above and will be summarized here, with added detail where necessary.

3.1.1 Non-count nouns. As indicated above in paragraph 1.3.3, the zero article in English may occur before unmodified common nouns of the types that are traditionally called "mass nouns" and "abstract nouns." I feel that there is no real structural motivation for treating these two noun types separately in either English or Hungarian since in the given language they have the same syntactic characteristics. In this study the general terms non-count noun or uncountable will be employed as cover terms to include both mass nouns and abstract nouns.[1]

3.1.1.1 Generic non-count nouns. Unmodified non-count nouns used generically in English are generally preceded by the zero article. In Hungarian, on the other hand, all generics collocate with the definite article, even if they are unqualified:

a. 1. Poverty is no disgrace.
　　　　　 2. <u>A</u> szegénység nem szégyen.

　　　　b. 1. Steel is a very useful metal.
　　　　　 2. <u>Az</u> acél (egy) nagyon hasznos fém.

　　　　c. 1. I don't like coffee.
　　　　　 2. Nem szeretem <u>a</u> kávét.

With restrictive modifiers, of course, uncountables lose their

generic value and appear with the definite article in English

also:

　　　　d. 1. <u>The</u> poverty he experienced in his youth ...
　　　　　 2. <u>The</u> steel they ordered last week ...

　　3.1.1.2 <u>Non-count nouns as partitives</u>. When a non-count

noun is used in a partitive (or unspecified) sense, the zero

article prevails in Hungarian as well as in English, although

<u>some</u> is a frequent alternate in the case of English partitives,

and <u>egy kis</u>, and other determiners in the case of Hungarian:

　　　　a. 1. I'd like coffee.[2]
　　　　　 2. Kávét kérek.

　　　　b. 1. Is there sugar on the table?
　　　　　 2. Van cukor az asztalon?

　　3.1.2 <u>Count-nouns</u>. Count-nouns also behave differently

with respect to the use of zero in the two languages being

studied here. While English count-nouns as a rule must have a

determiner other than zero--one notable exception being the

noun <u>man</u> used generically--Hungarian may have count-nouns, with

or without modifiers, with the zero article.

　　3.1.2.1 "<u>Classifying</u>" <u>nouns as predicates</u>. As indicated

in 2.2.1 above, the "classifying" predicate nominative in Hun-

garian (as in most languages of Europe) is preceded by the zero

article. By "classifying predicate nominative" is meant that

noun which names the class to which the subject noun belongs.
Some typical examples are:

a. 1. A fiam orvos.
2. My son is a doctor.

b. 1. A barátom jó tanár.
2. My friend is a good teacher.

c. 1. A barátaim tanárok.
2. My friends are teachers.

An examination of the last three examples given above shows
enough consistence in the use of the zero article in Hungarian
that an analytic segmentation of structures as given above would
have been unnecessary were it not for the fact that in English
the article usage varies with the number of the predicate noun.
Moreover, this use of the zero article with singular or plural,
modified or unmodified predicate nouns in Hungarian is only one
aspect of what we may now label zero as the mark of unspecified
noun in Hungarian. The zero article, then, marks an unspecified
noun in Hungarian, regardless of the number of syntactic posi-
tion or function of the noun in the sentence. For example, a
stressed unspecified noun with the zero article can appear in
the singular and as the subject of the sentence:

d. 1. Fiú van a kertben.
2. A boy is in the garden.

Countless other examples are to be found in which singular or
plural stressed or unstressed nouns in object position occur with
the zero article to indicate their unspecified nature:

e. 1. Fiút láttam a kertben.
2. I saw a boy in the garden.

f. 1. Újságot olvasok.
2. I'm reading a newspaper.

g. 1. Újságokat olvasok.
2. I'm reading newspapers.

49

3.1.3 <u>Unspecified possessive</u>. Also included in the un-
specified category of common nouns with the zero article in Hun-
garian is what I would call the "introductory possessive con-
struction." We have seen in 1.4.3 above that the definite ar-
ticle usually occurs with a possessed noun in Hungarian when the
possessor noun is deleted. This is true, however, only when the
possession has been previously mentioned or is situationally
understood. Therefore, if the fact of possession is just being
established in the discourse, then the zero article is used, not
the definite. This is, of course, parallel to the change from
the (introductory) definite article to the definite article with
common nouns in non-possessive constructions in both English and
Hungarian. In the case of "introductory" vs. "definite" posses-
sive constructions in English, the article usage changes from
the indefinite to the genitive article, as can be seen in the
following examples:

    a. 1. Kalapom van.
       2. I have <u>a</u> hat.

which in subsequent discourse may become, for example,

    b. 1. <u>A</u> kalapom az asztalon van.
       2. <u>My</u> hat is on the table.

This, of course, is a matter which will receive further treat-
ment in the subsequent discussion on definiteness.

3.2 <u>The zero article with proper nouns</u>

    As an introduction to our discussion on the use of the zero
article with proper nouns, it seems appropriate to restate and
to emphasize what had been briefly mentioned in 1.2 above, name-
ly, that there often is no clear-cut boundary between the cate-
gories "common" and "proper" when referring to, for example,

50

situationally identified nouns in one given language, and that, furthermore, the equivalent of what may be treated as a "clear-cut" proper noun in one language may not be so treated in another language. Moreover, as shown in 2.3, a noun treated as "proper" in one context may be converted to a "common noun" in another syntactic environment, depending on the definitional criteria one uses. With these admonitions in mind, and using the standard dictionary definition of proper noun[3] as a working hypothesis, we may now venture to proceed with our contrastive analysis.

3.2.1 Zero with an unqualified proper noun. The dictionary definition of proper noun quoted in footnote 3 notwithstanding, the lack of a "limiting modifier" can hardly be considered a necessary criterion for classifying lexical items as "proper nouns" in English. We have already seen that the definite article must be considered to be part of the name--of the "proper noun"--in such unqualified items as: the Hague, the Mississippi (River), the Azores, and countless others, not to mention such names as the United States, the Milky Way, the Northstar, etc., which also have a "qualifier" as an integral part of the name. The emphatic modal must was used in the preceding sentence for we clearly have:

and	a.	1.	Have you ever seen the/The Hague?
but not		2.	Have you ever seen Paris?
		3.	*Have you ever seen Hague?

also	b.	1.	Can you see the Northstar tonight?
and		2.	Can you see Venus tonight?
but not		3.	*Can you see Northstar tonight?

However, the occurrence of the definite article as a part of a name is not the statistical rule in either language being discussed here. This statement applies primarily to personal names

where zero is the rule, although we have already mentioned the
fact that personal names in Hungarian often occur with the defi-
nite article, as do some nicknames in English: a János 'John,'
a Kovács Pista, etc. 'Steve Smith,' etc.; the Toe, the Body, and
the like.

3.2.1.1 Family name as collective. Zero also occurs in
Hungarian constructions in which a family name is used in refer-
ence not to a single individual but to the whole identified fami-
ly bearing the name, although here, too, one may find instances
of the definite article as an optional element in the construc-
tion:

a. 1. Találkoztam (a) Kovácsékkal tegnap.
   2. I met the Smiths last night.

In historical contexts the article is required in Hungarian
also: the Habsburgs, a Habburgok, paralleling the usage re-
quired before the names of nationality groups used as collec-
tives: the Romans, a rómaiak; the Hungarians, a magyarok, etc.

3.2.2 Post-posed qualifiers in English personal names.
There is, however, a series of personal names in which both the
definite article and the qualifier of permanent characteristics
are present--in post-posed position--in English, while the Hun-
garian equivalent has the zero article with the pre-posed modi-
fier. Regardless of how one wants to interpret the English con-
struction synchronically, whether as a reduced appositive or
simply as a calque patterned after the French, the Hungarian
equivalent displays the regular pattern of zero article plus
qualifier plus noun that we have seen used with common nouns:

Charles the Bold   Merész Károly
Charles the Fair   Szép Károly

52

```
Frederick the Great        Nagy Frigyes
Richard the Second         Második Richárd
Henry the First            Elsö Henrik
```

As a curiosity may be mentioned the fact that with at least one

name of a royal ruler the French form has been preferred over

the two other competing constructions:

```
       Charlemagne              Nagy Károly
also Charles the Great
and   Charles the First
```

In this particular instance the English name also contains zero

in the first variant and is subject to modification as are other

names with zero, e.g., the great Charlemagne. This is, of

course, the same pattern as in, for example, the great Napoleon,

where the qualification may even be considered to be a regular

part of the name, depending on how strongly one is historically

oriented.

   3.2.3 _Place names with various qualifiers._ When place

names have post-posed restrictive modifiers of various kinds,

both English and Hungarian article usage alternates between

zero and the definite article. With the zero article we could

have:

        a. 1. Paris in the 18th century ...
           2. Párizs a 18. században ...

With optional variation in English:

        b. 1. (the) Paris of the 18th century ...
           2. a 18. századi Párizs

and normally with zero in English; the definite article in Hun-

garian:

        c. 1. 18th century Paris ...
           2. a 18. századi Párizs ...

A post-posed restrictive-clause modifier with a place name has

the same effect as with a personal name, as can be seen in the

following:

    d. 1. The Paris that we love.   (Book by Maurois,
                                     Cousteau, et al.)
       2. A Párizs, amelyet szeretünk.   or
       3. A mi szeretett Párizsunk.

It may be incidentally remarked here that a place name which

already has an article as a constituent appears with only one

article in English:[4]

              e. 1. The Hague that I love ...
    and not   2. *The the Hague that I love ...
                 3. A Hága, amelyet szeretek
    or: 4. Az én szeretett Hágám.

Under conditions of emphasis, however, English may substitute

the stressed allomorph of the /ði:/, while the Hungarian equiv-

alent under the same conditions displays a replacement of the

definite article by the demonstrative, which on the surface

seems to be composed of two juxtaposed definite articles, but

which must be interpreted differently because of stress place-

ment:

    f. 1. This isn't the United States (that) I used to
          know.
       2. Ez nem az az Egyesült Államok, amelyet én
          (valaha) ismertem.

As these types of constructions will be discussed further in

subsequent chapters, we shall accordingly end this section of

our analysis with the foregoing brief remark.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1.   It goes without saying that nouns which are otherwise "semantic equivalents" in English and Hungarian do not necessarily agree in membership in the categories of "countable" and "uncountable" nouns. In this section only those "equivalents" which agree in the latter respect also will be discussed here. See Chapter XVI for a fuller analysis of number as it applies to the grammars of English and Hungarian.

2.   Of course, like other non-count nouns, coffee and its Hungarian counterpart kávé may be converted to count-nouns with the meaning "serving or portion of coffee," as in the informal request "Two coffees, please." Hungarian has "Két kávét kérek" as an equivalent, and may go even further in reduction with "Két feketét, (kérek)," "Two blacks (please)."

3.   For example, the definition found in Webster's Third New International Dictionary, page 1818a: "A noun that designates a particular being or thing, does not take a limiting modifier, and is usu. capitalized in English." The second part of this definition, strictly speaking, would eliminate such proper names as the Hague, the Atlantic (Ocean), the United States, etc., from the category "proper noun"--not to mention all others used in varying ways discussed in this work--inasmuch as the definition of "limiting" given elsewhere in the same dictionary (page 1313a) must include the definite article: "of a modifying word: serving to limit the application of the modified noun without reference to quality, kind, or condition (as this in this book, which in which book)--or to express the absence of limitation (as any in any book)--distinguished from descriptive." As the term "proper name" is a widespread equivalent of "proper noun," it will also be used in this work as a full synonym of the latter.

4.   The decision as to which article is deleted from the underlying structure here seems to be completely arbitrary.

PART TWO

THE CATEGORY OF DEFINITENESS

INTRODUCTION TO PART TWO

With the completion of the above survey of article usage
in English and Hungarian, we may now turn our attention to
another important aspect of grammatical structure, namely the
category of definiteness in English and Hungarian. This gram-
matical and syntactic category not only has close structural
connections with article selection in the two languages being
contrasted here, but with other types of syntactic relation-
ships as well. Unfortunately, spacial limitations will prevent
us from examining all linguistically important aspects of this
problem.[1] Because of the wide range of categories to be covered
in this contrastive work, we can give only the most salient con-
trastive features of this particular category at this time. A
conscious knowledge of these salient features, however, is ab-
solutely essential for a proper command of both the articles
and the conjugational system of Hungarian. Consequently, at
least the following minimal information relating to definite-
ness should be noted by the speaker of English attempting to ac-
quire a workable command of Hungarian.

The all-pervading nature of the grammatical category of
definiteness in English has been recognized in linguistic liter-
ature for quite some time, but attempts to define it formally
have not met with great success. For Bloomfield (1933:204), for
example, this category remained a hazy notion, and he was forced
to rely heavily on semantic criteria--which he otherwise es-
chewed--rather than structural criteria for his incipient formu-
lation.

57

> The definite and indefinite cate-
> gories may be said, in fact, to em-
> brace the entire class of English
> noun expressions, because even those
> types of noun expressions which do
> not always take a determiner, can
> be classed as definite or indefinite:
> <u>John</u>, for instance, as definite,
> <u>kindness</u> as indefinite.

Why <u>John</u> is more "definite" than <u>kindness</u> is not further ex-

plained, not even on semantic grounds, by Bloomfield. One can

certainly find no structural basis for considering either noun

in isolation as definite, for both collocate with the same de-

terminer, zero. When either is modified, the same determiner is

used in the ensuing structures. It is only in a discourse con-

text that we can speak of any noun phrase as being "definite,"

and it is only then that the nature of the noun phrase deter-

mines which particular determiner will be manifested in the

given syntactic structure. The "nature" of the noun phrase,

then, clearly includes both semantic and syntactic criteria,

for restrictions placed on the occurrence of any noun in a given

environment depend, first of all, on the semantic properties of

the noun, then on its syntactic properties. These semantic and

syntactic features are difficult to separate, inasmuch as the

"total meaning" of any lexical item includes the whole range of

environments in which the item can occur. A purely structural

definition of the grammatical category of definiteness is, con-

sequently, doomed to failure. Hence, we can understand Bloom-

field's hesitancy, as a structural linguist, to launch into a

fuller analysis of the phenomenon.

More recently, Carlotta Smith (1964:37), working within

the framework of transformational-generative grammar, has at-

tempted to give a structural definition of the category of

definiteness, although, like Bloomfield, she begins her inquiry
within a semantic-notional framework:

> Speakers make distinctions of defi-
> niteness and indefiniteness for all
> noun phrases, not just those with
> the determiners <u>the</u> or <u>a</u>. For in-
> stance, <u>John</u> is said by many speak-
> ers to be more definite than <u>the</u>
> <u>man</u>, which is in turn more definite
> than <u>any man</u>; <u>my book</u> is more defi-
> nite than <u>the book</u>.

Smith (1964:38) then attempts to give a structural formulation
to these intuitive statements, and, on the basis of ability to
"accept" restrictive or non-restrictive clauses, goes on to
postulate the existence not of a dichotomy of "definite" and
"indefinite determiners," but rather a scale of definiteness
as it relates to determiners. The highest degree of definite-
ness, which Smith labels "unique," is characteristic of $\emptyset$ with
a proper noun, which accepts appositive (non-restrictive) re-
latives only. On the other extreme of the scale is the "un-
specified" degree, which is characteristic of such determiners
as <u>any</u> or <u>all</u>, which accept restrictive clauses only. In the
middle is the "specified" degree, characteristic of <u>a</u>, <u>the</u>, or
$\emptyset$, which accept either restrictive or non-restrictive clauses.

In this study I will attempt to show that such a tripartite
division of definiteness is indeed necessary, but that Smith's
formulation is deficient on several grounds. It is readily ap-
parent, for example, that $\emptyset$ appears in two categories, unique
and specified, and that its presence in the unique class is
bound up with its co-occurrence with a proper noun. Several
questions immediately arise: 1) If the definiteness of $\emptyset$ is
dependent on patterning with different noun phrase types, how
is $\emptyset$ any "more definite" than <u>the</u>, which, among other things,

59

can also precede a proper noun?   and 2) Under what conditions do
proper nouns occur with determiners other than $\emptyset$, and what is
the status of definiteness of such proper nouns?   These and sim-
ilar questions may well be asked here because in her formulation
Smith proceeds _from_ type of determiner, "developed by expansion
rules at the phrase structure level of the grammar," (1964:38)
_to_ co-occurrence restrictions: "The determiner of the noun
phrase is the decisive element in the acceptance of relative
clauses." (p.37)   What will be attempted in this part of this
study is an analysis of the conditions which _determine the selec-_
tion of a particular determiner in the first place.

While there are to my knowledge no full-length descriptive
analyses dealing primarily with the category of definiteness in
Hungarian, there are many shorter statements dealing with it to
be found in traditional and structural grammars of Hungarian.
Since it has an immediate effect on the selection of verb conju-
gation, definiteness is nearly always mentioned secondarily in
connection with verb forms, not as a grammatical category in it-
self (e.g., Tompa 1962:158-60).   As is well known, Hungarian has
two contrasting sets of verbal personal suffixes used on transi-
tive verbs, depending on the nature of the direct object noun
phrase.   If the object noun phrase is considered to be "definite,"
then the personal endings of the "definite conjugation" are em-
ployed; if, on the other hand, the object noun phrase is not con-
sidered to be "definite" (or if the given verb is intransitive
as such or is used without an object), then the endings of the
"indefinite conjugation" are called for.[2]

The criteria for determining when a given noun phrase is to
be considered "definite" in Hungarian are partly structional and

partly notional, as in English, and in part so closely resemble
the traditional criteria given for the parallel category in En-
glish that they seem to be paraphrases of them. A typical series
of statements of this sort is given by Bánhidi, Jókay, and Szabó
(1965:112-13):

> The object is considered definite:--
>
> (a) if the object is preceded by the definite article
>   a, az ...
> (b) if the object is a proper noun ...
> (c) if the object is the 3rd person pronoun: őt, őket,
>   or a demonstrative pronoun ...
> (d) if the object is expressed by an object clause ...
> (e) if the object is a noun to which a possessive suffix
>   has been added ...

Criteria (b), (c), and (e) above are remarkably similar to those
indicated, for example, in the following quotation from an ar-
ticle written by a transformationist (Fillmore 1964:967): "...
restrictive relative clauses are not attached to definite nouns
like MY WIFE, definite pronouns, and proper names." Furthermore,
criterion (d), object classes, is the main topic of discussion
of the article by Fillmore from which the above quotation was
taken.

Now in regard to the list of criteria for determining defi-
niteness of noun phrases in Hungarian, one can immediately think
of a considerable number of obvious questions which must be an-
swered if one is to arrive at an adequate statement as to when a
given noun phrase is actually definite. In giving answers to
these questions on noun phrases in Hungarian, one simultaneously
gives answers to similar questions relating to noun phrases in
English as well, for, as we shall soon see, we are dealing with
phenomena which are at least bilingually "universal." The fol-
lowing may be included in questions of this type:

(a) 1. Just when is the definite article used in Hungarian and English?
    2. Does a noun phrase with the definite article always behave the same way structurally with regard to the category of definiteness?

(b) 1. What is a proper noun anyway?
    2. Are "proper nouns" always "proper nouns"?

(c) 1. Are all 3rd person pronouns definite?
    2. Are any pronouns of the other persons definite?

(d) 1. Are all object clauses definite?
    2. What verbs govern object clauses of other types?

(e) 1. Are all possessive forms definite?
    2. How are possessives otherwise marked for definiteness?

Our aim in Part II of this study, then, is to investigate such questions relating to the category of definiteness in both English and Hungarian, and, for the purposes of easier explication, we shall divide our discussion into chapters according to the five main criteria given above, with the exception that definite and indefinite pronouns are afforded separate chapters because of their great number and complexity.

62

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION TO PART II

1. For more detail regarding definiteness and indefinite-
ness in English and Hungarian, see Orosz 1969, which is an ex-
panded version of Part II.

2. The indefinite and definite conjugations are also called
"subjective" and "objective" (Hungarian <u>alanyi</u> and <u>tárgyas</u>) re-
spectively. However, I agree with John Lotz (1962:320), who
calls this terminology "misleading." In sentences as, for ex-
ample, "János újságot olvas," 'John is reading a newspaper,'
and "János az újságot olvassa," 'John is reading the newspaper,'
the traditional terms and their Hungarian counterparts do abso-
lutely nothing to specify under what conditions the indefinite
conjugation is employed, as in the first example, nor why the
definite is employed in a sentence as the second. In the same
article cited above Lotz introduces the terms "non-determinate"
and "determinate" for indefinite and definite respectively. I
am retaining the latter set of terms here, however, as they have
slightly more mnemonic value.

63

CHAPTER IV

THE DEFINITE ARTICLE AS A MARKER OF DEFINITENESS

4.0 Introduction

For the purpose of initiating our discussion of definite-
ness we may repeat a statement made earlier: "The principal
use of the definite article in both languages is to mark a nomi-
nal as having been previously identified. This identification
may stem from previous mention in the discourse or from the situ-
ation in which the discourse is taking place." This statement
is obviously an oversimplification, and what is needed now is a
discussion of: a) what actually constitutes "previous mention"
which is adequate for making a noun (phrase) definite, and b) to
what extent does the discourse "situation" provide sufficient
mutual knowledge for given entities to be considered "definite"
without having been overtly mentioned in the prior discourse.
The following discussion of these and related issues will be
conducted primarily from the point of view of the English lan-
guage, but will be applicable--unless otherwise stated--to the
corresponding situations in Hungarian as well, as the transla-
tions of the English sample sentences will testify.

4.1 Previous mention in discourse

While it is generally well known that the use of the defi-
nite article is sometimes obligatory with a noun phrase that has
been previously introduced into a discourse, the total picture
of this aspect of article usage is by no means clear as yet. The
reason for the lingering uncertainty in this area of linguistic
analysis perhaps lies in the fact that the area includes both

aspects of "meaning," which has been shunned for so long by structuralists, and also "extra-linguistic" factors, which is a catch-all phrase often used by transformationalists as a substitute for "extrasentential," their formal analysis not extending beyond the (single) sentence. Definiteness must be viewed in light of the whole discourse,[1] and upon closer inspection of such discourse situations, it becomes quite apparent that "previous mention" of a noun may be so varied that subsequent use of the definite article with the previously mentioned noun may be either obligatory, optional, or totally excluded.

4.1.1 Obligatory use of the definite article after previous mention. The obligatory use of the definite article with nouns that (or the referents of which) have been previously mentioned in the discourse may be illustrated in the following sample sentences:

a. 1. I saw a pretty woman with a small girl yester-
day. The woman said ...
2. Láttam tegnap egy csinos nőt egy kis lánnyal
együtt. A nő azt mondta·...

Here, and in similar discourse situations, two factors are operating simultaneously to call for the obligatory use of the definite article in the second sentence of each pair: 1) The introduction of a woman in the first sentence, which as declarative and non-negative, is sufficient for definitization, while 2) the fact that there are two female referents in the introductory sentence militates against the use of the ("definite") personal pronoun she, which would otherwise be preferred in ordinary conversational situations. The equivalent situation in Hungarian is similar except that the gender distinction of the 3rd person personal pronoun is lacking. The use of the article together

65

with the noun in Hungarian is likewise mandatory, however, since there are two 3rd person referents present in the first sentence, precluding the unambiguous use of the singular 3rd person personal pronoun ő (or zero) before the verb. After the introductory sentence, such as in a.1, the use of a woman (Hungarian egy nő) in referring to the same woman further in the discourse could be considered ungrammatical; the use of she (Hungarian ő or zero) would be considered ambiguous, and would require further identification. Hence the use of the term "obligatory" in this section. The use of the definite article to mark the noun as having been previously mentioned is obligatory, then, for normal, effective communication in both languages being analyzed here.

4.1.2 Optional use of the definite article after previous mention. We have just alluded above to an obvious situation in which the use of the definite article could be considered optional in either language. Whenever a discourse phase begins with a sentence which has but one new referent introduced into the discourse, the subsequent occurrences of the previously-mentioned noun with the definite article may be replaced by a personal pronoun (by definition, in the third person) in English, and by a third-person personal pronoun or zero ㅗn Hungarian. This is perhaps the most common process of definitization in the spoken standards, although the use of the subsequent noun phrase with the definite article can hardly be labelled "ungrammatical." Everyday discourse situations are replete with examples of this type of "definite" pronoun usage. We shall, however, give but one sample sentence here for the sake of brevity:

a. 1. I talked to a pretty woman yesterday. The woman
said ...
or   2. I talked to a pretty woman yesterday. She said
...

b. 1. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. A nő azt
mondta ...
or   2. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. Ő azt
mondta ...
or   3. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. Azt mondta
...

It can also be seen from the second sentence in b.3 that, be-
cause of the verbal suffixes being unambiguously marked for per-
son and number, Hungarian has an additional optional replacement
possibility for the previously-mentioned noun phrase, namely zero.
This replacement is "optional," of course, only to the extent
that the unambiguous, unemphatic discourse situation allows the
process to take place. Ambiguous contexts, emphasis, or con-
trast would naturally block its occurrence. The whole phenome-
non of the replacement of the definite article + noun phrase is
complex enough to warrant further discussion, as is the whole
process of pronominalization in general; consequently we must
defer further analysis of it until the following chapter.

4.1.3 Excluded use of the definite article after "previous
mention." No discussion of the use of the definite article to
mark a previously-mentioned noun would be complete without a
statement of recognition of the fact that "previous mention"
actually does not always establish a discourse referent capable
of allowing an acceptable definitization of the noun phrase to
take place in subsequent discourse.[2] For example, although a
car is "mentioned" in the first clause of the sentence in a.1
below, it would be at least semantically anomalous to continue
with the car in the second clause, since the actual existence

67

of the car has just been denied. There is no actual discourse
referent present:

> a. 1. *I don't have a car, but the car is black.
> 2. *Nincs-kocsim, de a kocsi fekete.

Here again, a fuller discussion of these matters would lead us
too far into the field of philosophy; consequently, we shall al-
low these brief observations to stand as they are at this point.

4.1.4 <u>Synonyms</u> <u>in</u> <u>previous</u> <u>mention</u>. Another aspect of def-
initization through previous mention is likewise difficult to
characterize analytically, but is nonetheless quite frequent at
all levels of usage and warrants mention at this point in our
study. This phenomenon is the use of different morphological
forms to refer to the same entity in different parts of the dis-
course, a topic which has received considerable attention in re-
cent linguistic literature, particularly literature dealing with
the development of the theory of transformational-generative
grammar.[3] These alternate forms of the noun phrase may range
from recognized (or approximate synonyms of the previously-
mentioned noun) to mere subjective characterization of the re-
ferent in question ("pronominal epithets"). Thus in the follow-
ing sentences we can have definite noun phrases following previ-
ously-mentioned ones even though the subsequently occurring noun
phrases have nothing in common morphologically with the latter:

> a. 1. I met a wise man yesterday, and <u>the</u> <u>sage</u> told me
>   many interesting things.
> 2. I came across a street urchin yesterday and
>   caught <u>the</u> little <u>tyke</u> trying to pick my pocket.
> 3. I met a fast-talking salesman yesterday, and <u>the</u>
>   <u>robber</u> tried to sell me a radio at double the
>   regular price.

This is perhaps a form of " situational identification," for al-
though the definite nouns in the second parts of the above

sentences have not been mentioned, strictly speaking, in the pre-
ceding part of the sentence, the native hearer knows that the two
noun phrases in each sentence refer to the same individual in
each case. The mere juxtaposition of the two noun phrases in
each sentence is sufficient for this mutual understanding. To
what extent such (obviously optional) switching takes place at
various levels of usage is more a stylistic, rather than a lin-
guistic matter, but it must be recognized that it is by no means
a rare phenomenon in either language. Possible Hungarian equiv-
alents of the above sentences are the following:

b. 1. Egy okos embert ismertem meg tegnap, és a
      bölcs(elő) sok érdekes dolgot mondott nekem.
   2. Egy utcagyerek került az utamba tegnap, és
      rajtakaptam a kis komiszt, amint ki akart
      zsebelni.
   3. Egy fontoskodó ügynökkel találkoztam tegnap, és
      a csirkefogó egy rádiót akart nekem eladni
      dupla áron.

4.1.5 Definite noun phrases as part of previously-mentioned
noun. Another subtype of definitization through previous mention
which more or less merges with situational identification occurs
with the employment of a definite noun phrase which represents
only part of the previously mentioned (collective) noun, or
which names the individual members of which the group is com-
posed or which are naturally or culturally associated with the
entity in question. There may or may not be any overt morphemic
connection between the two given noun phrases, but inasmuch as
the speaker assumes his hearer possesses the body of knowledge
necessary to make the proper connection between the two nouns
without further elaboration, the second noun phrase may be an
unqualified definite noun phrase in the same manner as an "iden-
tical" noun can, or any of the "synonyms" mentioned in the

previous paragraph.   Several examples of this type of definiti-
zation are as follows:

a. 1. I saw a parade yesterday.
   2. The marchers all wore old-fashioned costumes.

b. 1. There was a big traffic jam downtown yesterday.
   2. The cars were jammed bumper-to-bumper for ten
      blocks.

c. 1. I observed a very interesting class yesterday.
   2. The students were very intelligent.

When the relationship between the two given noun phrases is not
that of a part to the whole but rather one of conventional as-
sociation, then distinction between the two types of definitiza-
tion being discussed here is indeed hazy, as in: "A firetruck
... The firemen ..."[4]

4.2 Situational identification of noun phrases

Besides being previously mentioned, another way in which a
given noun phrase may be considered eligible for collocation with
the definite article is through what I have broadly labelled
"situational identification." This term is simply a catch-all
expression to indicate merely that, in a particular discourse
situation, both speaker and hearer are presumed to know what the
referent of a given noun phrase is without its having been men-
tioned in prior discourse.   The term situation is to be taken in
its broadest sense here--from one's immediate environment to the
whole of the knowable universe.   This proposition may be resting
on shaky philosophical grounds, but it is, I believe, a simple
and practical analytical solution to an involved problem which
otherwise requires extensive explication.   In paragraph 1.2
above we gave examples of typical situationally-identified noun
phrases in English and Hungarian.   These examples should suffice

to illustrate the principle involved here, although their number could have easily been extended into the thousands.

4.3 Structural correlates of definitization as marked by definite article

To turn the notion of definiteness into a grammatical category one needs, of course, to find structural relationships between the definitized noun phrase in question and other elements in the discourse. This is, naturally, a relatively simple matter when it comes to article usage. We have seen that the use of the definite article may be even required before a noun phrase which has been definitized by previous mention in the discourse, and, in addition to this, that the definite article may be used before other nouns, the referents of which, in the given discourse situations, are mutually known (or can be pointed to) and therefore may be considered definite without having been mentioned in prior discourse. Now what remains here for us is to determine what other structural significance may be attached to the fact that a given noun--in either language--is considered to be definite. In addition to the obvious patterning with the definite article the following structural relationships may be considered as being necessary correlates to the definitization of noun phrases. We shall start first with the pertinent structural pattern of English.

4.3.1 Occurrence with non-restrictive clauses. The unqualified statement has often been made in recent linguistic literature that restrictive relative clauses are not attached to definite nouns (e.g., Fillmore 1964:96). An obvious corollary to this statement would be the supposition that definite noun phrases

collocate only with non-restrictive clauses. Both of these as-
sertions are false, as can be readily determined from an exami-
nation of the syntactic behavior of definitized noun phrases with
the as their determiner. We have already indicated in the Intro-
duction to Part II that, as Carlotta Smith (1964:38) pointed out,
if patterning with relative clauses is to be taken as the chief
criterion for determining definiteness, then there seems to be
justification for postulating not two, but three degrees of def-
initeness. This seems reasonable inasmuch as a noun phrase with
the may pattern with either type of relative clause, depending
on other factors in the discourse, while the remaining noun types
tend to pattern either with restrictive clauses solely, or only
with non-restrictive ones. Accordingly, it does seem to be true
at first glance that the man, for example, can be followed only
by non-restrictive clauses, unless the clause which follows is
a repetition (or paraphrase) of the prior mention itself which
formed the basis of the definitization process in the first
place:[5]

    a. 1. I met an interesting man yesterday.
       2. *The man who was very intelligent told me many
          interesting things.
       3. The man (whom) I met (yesterday) was very
          intelligent.

Now except for such a repetitive clause as in a.3, it is indeed
quite difficult to construct a restrictive clause that would
readily be acceptable with a definitized (and singular) noun
phrase such as the man. However, when one considers plural
noun phrases, then the feature of "totality" vs. "partiality"
must be taken into consideration. This we shall do in the fol-
lowing paragraph. However, for the moment it seems necessary
that we view the obverse of the coin in regard to the

co-occurrence of noun phrases with restrictive clauses. As in-
dicated above, a _definite_ noun phrase, such as _the_ _man_ in a.2,
cannot be modified by·a non-restrictive relative clause if the
noun phrase refers to _all_ of the previously-mentioned refer-
ent(s), which, indeed, singular noun phrases do. When it comes
to _indefinite_ noun phrases, on the other hand, we can show that
these can be followed by restrictive clauses only, and not by
non-restrictive ones. The following examples illustrate this
feature of indefinite noun phrases:

      b. 1. Yesterday I met a man who is very interesting.
         2. *Yesterday I met a man, who is very interesting.[6]
         3. We are looking for a speaker who is interesting.
         4. *We are looking for a speaker, who is interesting.

and also: c. 1. Any book which is about sex is interesting.
           2. *Any book, which is about sex, is interesting.

In summary, then, we may state that some definite noun phrases
(i.e., those with the syntactic feature of _totality_) can collo-
cate only with non-restrictive relative clauses (appostive
clauses), other definites (i.e., those with the feature of par-
tiality) pattern with restrictive clauses, while indefinite
noun phrases can pattern with restrictive relative clauses only.

    4.3.2 _Partiality_ _indicated_ _by_ _a_ _non-restrictive_ _clause._
When a definite noun phrase is in the plural, there can be a
contrast in relative clause type (with a corresponding contrast
in meaning) following the noun, which is not possible with sin-
gular definite noun phrases. The following sentences were given
previously to illustrate this:

      a. 1. I met a group of (or _some_, etc.) men yesterday.
         2. The men, who were intelligent, were very inter-
           esting.
         3. The men who were intelligent were very interest-
           ing.

Sentence b.2 has the obvious meaning that all of the men were both intelligent and interesting; b.3, on the other hand, implies that only some of the men were intelligent and that only these were interesting. Consequently, while there can be no doubt that the men in b.2 and b.3 are noun phrases made definite through previous mention in b.1, it is primarily the presence or absence of the additional syntactic feature of totality which determines the type of relative clause admissible after the given noun phrase. (In generative terms, there is a difference in deep structures.) Now it must be recognized that totality is a feature of the discourse in the same way that definiteness is, for totality is considered in relation to the (plural or collective) noun phrase previously mentioned in the discourse. Therefore, the men in b.2 represent all of the men previously mentioned in b.1, while in b.3, the men represent a totality only in relation to those meeting the requirements of intelligence, and not in relation to the previously-mentioned persons as a whole group.

4.4 Structural correlates of definiteness in Hungarian

We have already shown in the first chapter that the use of the definite article in Hungarian parallels the use of the definite article in English in many instances. Both processes of definitization which were discussed mainly in regard to the noun phrase in English, i.e., previous mention and situational identification, apply to Hungarian noun phrases as well, as we have seen from the examples in sections 4.1 and 4.2. In addition to this, rules governing the replacement of definite noun phrases preceded by the definite article, or rules applying restrictions

74

on the employment of definite noun phrases are also much the same in the two languages being analyzed here. It remains for us now 1) to test whether co-occurrence restrictions apply to definite noun phrases and relative clauses in Hungarian also, and 2) to determine what other structural manifestations are inherent in the category of definiteness in Hungarian.

4.4.1 <u>Co-occurrence of definite noun phrases with relative clauses</u>. In paragraph 4.3.2 we have tried to indicate that it is the presence or absence of the syntactic feature of totality which is the crucial factor in determining whether a non-restrictive or restrictive clause is to follow a definite noun phrase in English.[7] From the Hungarian equivalents for the English examples from this same paragraph which we now give below, it can be seen that, while the same semantic distinctions regarding totality and partiality can be and are made in the definitization process in both languages, the structural patterns employed to signal these distinctions do vary from one language to the next. Compare the English sentences discussed above with their equivalents:

a. 1. I met a group of men yesterday.
   2. The men, who were intelligent, were very interesting.
   3. The men who were intelligent were very interesting.

b. 1. Egy csoport férfit ismertem meg tegnap.
   2. A férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek is voltak.
   3. Azok a férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek is voltak.

Since there is apparently no regular phonemic (nor, as we can see, graphemic) distinction between a restrictive and a non-restrictive relative clause in such instances in Hungarian, the

75

distinction here between total and partial subsequent reference must be made elsewhere. in the sentence. Thus, while English singles out part of the group of men mentioned in a.1 by adding an indispensable qualification to the subsequently definite noun in a.3, Hungarian achieves the same type of focus by the additional employment of the stressed demonstrative pronoun (b.3), inasmuch as the definite article alone cannot bear full stress here. The combination of demonstrative plus definite article corresponds to the demonstrative adjective this/that, these/those in English, but because of morphological considerations to be discussed further below, it should be analyzed, nonetheless, as being composed of two separate elements.

4.4.1.1 **Different clause types as marked by pronouns in Hungarian.** Although in the examples given immediately above, only plural relative pronouns could be used to refer to the plural subjects, there are instances where a contrast of totality vs. partiality may be achieved by the use of a singular vs. a plural relative pronoun. This seems to be limited to instances where the antecedent of the pronoun in question is semantically plural but grammatically singular. (See Chapter XIX for further illustrations of this.) The English glosses show that the object in a.1 is only a part of the whole, while in b.1 it is the totality of poems mentioned:

> a. 1. Három Petőfi verset olvastam, ami érdekes volt.
>   2. I read three Petofi poems which were interesting.
>
> b. 1. Három Petőfi verset olvastam, amik érdekes voltak.
>   2. I read three Petofi poems, all of which were interesting.

This pattern, however, seems to be quite restricted, and not at all as consistent as the one illustrated previously.

4.4.2 _Definite conjugation with definite noun phrase objects._ Perhaps the most widely discussed aspect of the category of definiteness in Hungarian is the fact that there are two contrasting sets of personal transitive-verb endings, the selection of which depends on the degree of definiteness of the direct object of the verb in question. These conjugation types have varying names, but, as indicated above, the pedagogically useful designations _definite conjugation_ and _indefinite conjugation_ will be used in this work. Many pedagogical grammars of Hungarian state simply that the definite conjugation is employed when the direct object, if any, is considered "definite;" otherwise the endings of the indefinite conjugation are used. The first "criterion" of definiteness which is usually given, then, is the presence of the definite article before the object noun. This practice was followed in the list of criteria given in the Introduction to Part II of this study. This structural relationship, definite conjugation with definite noun object marked by the definite article, seems to hold true in all cases, for in the data used in this study there are no instances of the definite conjugation _not_ being used when the direct object is a definitized noun phrase with _az_. At the same time, many, if not all, of the remaining criteria usually given for definiteness are either subject to qualification of some sort, or are structurally dependent on the unmistakable definiteness of noun phrases which are preceded by _az_.

4.4.3 _Contrasts in verb endings with definite and indefinite noun objects._ We have shown above that, while the same type of definitization process takes place in both languages

under study here, the surface manifestations of the definite ar-
ticle before situationally identified nouns of various types do
not always coincide. Consequently, conjugation selection may
look erratic from the English point of view simply because En-
glish article usage is often "erratic," that is to say, has ex-
ceptions within even one noun type. We have shown, for example,
that in Hungarian the use of the definite article with nouns
used generically--here re-interpreted as "situationally identi-
fied"--is consistent while the English varies. Conjugation type
usage in Hungarian, accordingly, will vary with the generic or
non-generic employment of the noun, i.e., with the presence or
absence of the definite article, while the English forms give
no hint of variation in article (or, of course, verb) usage.
The following examples of this phenomenon are given:[8]

  a. 1. I like coffee.   (generic)
    2. Szeret<u>em</u> a kávét.

  b. 1. I'd like coffee.   (non-generic)
    2. Kávét szeretn<u>ék</u>.

  c. 1. I don't like cats.   (generic)
    2. Nem szeret<u>em</u> a macskákat.

It goes without saying that it is not only generic constructions
which conceal their (situationally identified) definite features
by the lack of the definite article in English. Singular count-
nouns in English may be qualified in such a manner that the def-
inite article is not manifested, while the Hungarian equivalent
retains the expected definite article, and, as a consequence, em-
ploys the definite conjugation if such a noun is the direct ob-
ject of the verb. Typical examples of this type of definite con-
struction in English are those which have a "genitive construc-
tion" in place of the definite article, which may or may not have

a possessive construction in the Hungarian equivalent, as illustrated in the following example:

    d. 1. I'm reading today's newspaper.[9]
       2. Olvasom a mai újságot.

This definite usage is in contrast with the non-specified use of the noun, requiring the use of an indefinite determiner in the singular in English, but with optional zero--and the indefinite conjugation--with both singular or plural count-nouns so employed in Hungarian:

    e. 1. I'm reading a newspaper.
       2. Ujságot olvasok.

    f. 1. I'm reading (some) old newspapers.
       2. Régi újságokat olvasok.

4.4.4 _The effect of word order on the use of the definite conjugation in Hungarian._ While it is certainly true that a single definite noun phrase used as a direct object in Hungarian entails the use of the definite conjugation, it is not necessarily true that this same definite noun phrase object would govern the use of the definite conjugation if there is also an indefinite noun phrase present as an object of the same verb in the same clause.[10] Here it is a matter of the placement of emphasis through word order, for if the definite noun phrase occurs directly before the verb, in the position of maximum emphasis, or immediately after the verb and before the indefinite object, then the definite conjugation is used. Otherwise the indefinite noun phrase is in an emphatic position and consequently blocks the use of the definite conjugation. The following examples will illustrate this:

    a. 1. A tanár látja a fiút és egy lányt.
       2. A tanár egy lányt és a fiút látja.
       3. A tanár a fiút látja és egy lányt.
       4. The teacher sees the boy and a girl.

b. 1. A tanár lát egy lányt és a fiút.
                       2. A tanár a fiút és egy lányt lát. 11
                       3. A tanár egy lányt lat és a fiút.
                       4. The teacher sees a girl and the boy.

In sentence a.1, the definite noun phrase a_ fiút is in the "nor-

mal" (i.e., non-emphatic) object position after the verb and gov-

erns the definite conjugation because of proximity. In a.2 and

a.3, on the other hand, the definite noun phrase is in the em-

phatic position immediately preceding the verb, which, as a con-

sequence, must have the ending of the definite conjugation re-

gardless of where the indefinite noun phrase is located in the

sentence. These sentences may be contrasted to those in b.,

where the indefinite noun phrase object now intrudes between the

verb and the definite noun phrase and in this way prevents the

employment of the definite conjugation. Occurrence in the posi-

tion of emphasis immediately before the verb not only governs

the use of the conjugation types in Hungarian, but has a great

deal of other syntactic significance as well, as will be shown

in Part III.

4.5 Summary of structural correlates of definitization

In this chapter, after having established that only previous

mention and situational identification make a noun phrase defi-

nite in either English or Hungarian, we have shown that, in ad-

dition to the ability to pattern with the definite article,

there are other structural manifestations in both languages re-

lating to the definitization of a noun phrase. In English,

first of all, we have seen that a definite noun phrase can be

followed by a non-restrictive relative clause (when the addition-

al feature of totality--in relation to the previously-mentioned

referent--is present in the definite noun phrase). Otherwise

a restrictive clause is possible after the noun phrase. In Hungarian, on the other hand, while there seems to be no regular phonemic or graphemic distinction between the two types of relative clause, the definite noun phrase denoting only _part_ of the referent (previously mentioned or not) is marked by the employment of the demonstrative pronoun before the definite article. In addition to this, Hungarian also shows agreement in definiteness between the transitive verb and its direct object, a "definite" noun (phrase) object requiring the use of the definite conjugation, the indefinite conjugation being used otherwise. The feature of totality was shown to have an important bearing structurally in the aspects of definiteness discussed so far in this study. Consequently, it may be more accurate to reword the above statement and say that a _definite_ _and_ _total_ noun phrase object requires the use of the definite conjugation. This latter statement now remains to be tested in the remaining chapters of Part II.

1. If definiteness is not viewed in light of the whole discourse, then such circular (pedagogically motivated?) explanations as the following can intrude in the place of scientific analysis: "Nouns can also be definite (⟨+definite⟩) or (⟨-definite⟩). ... in order to tell whether the common noun "table" is ⟨+definite⟩ or ⟨-definite⟩ we have to look at the article." Roderick A. Jacobs and Peter S. Rosenbaum (1967b:45). "Since the noun is definite (⟨+definite⟩), there is a transformation called the article transformation which inserts "the" into the deep structure ... The article transformation depends upon features of the noun, for example, definiteness (⟨+definite⟩ or ⟨-definite⟩) ..." Idem., page 46.

2. I owe a great deal of the analysis in this section to Lauri Karttunen (1968b:6-9).

3. For example, see Karttunen (1968a) for a recent discussion of these matters and for a list of works (mostly unpublished) which are pertinent to the discussion here.

4. This type of "previous mention" is listed as category (iii) in Karttunen's list of discourse situations in which definitization may take place without overt prior mention (1968a:13). Since this type of definitization does occur in a "linguistic context," that is, a referent for the definite noun phrase is overtly mentioned in some manner in the discourse, I am including it under "previous mention," although it may require a great deal of philosophizing to draw any sort of dividing line between previous mention and situational identification in such cases.

5. Non-restrictive clauses are characterized by open juncture, which sets them apart from the rest of the utterance in speech. Traditional orthography reflects this fairly consistently by setting off such clauses by the use of commas. This practice, of course, will be followed here. Restrictive clauses are characterized by closed juncture in speech and the lack of commas in writing.

6. The distinction between an "introductory" indefinite noun phrase, e.g., a man of b.1 (i.e., a certain man) and an "unspecified" indefinite noun phrase, e.g., a speaker (i.e., any speaker of the stated qualifications), although vital structurally in both English and Hungarian, will be ignored here for the time being. We have already shown above why, in fact, a restrictive clause cannot modify a speaker here, for the same semantic or logical considerations which militate against definitizing a noun phrase for which no discourse referent has actually been established, also militate against the use of an appositive clause with a noun phrase which is not a proper discourse referent.

7. While up to this point in our exposition of definiteness, we have dealt primarily with noun phrases which have the definite article as their determiner, this statement holds true

for all definite noun phrases of whatever construction type. In
2.3 we have already alluded to the way this aspect of definite-
ness affects the behavior of proper nouns, and in the following --
chapters all of the other types of noun phrases considered "defi-
nite" in either language will be dealt with.

8. For the reader who is not familiar with the indefinite
and definite conjugational endings in Hungarian, the following
(back-vowel) paradigm (present indicative) is given:

Indefinite conjugation			Definite conjugation		
1. látok	látunk	'I see,' etc.	látom	látjuk	'I see
2. látsz	láttok		látod	látjátok	(it),'
3. lát	látnak		látja	látják	etc.

Other phonologically or morphologically based variations are
possible, but they need not concern us at the moment.

9. The (overtly definite) construction the newspaper of
today is also a possible (formal?) alternate here; but, inasmuch
as it is construed as generic, it does not readily pattern with
the present continuous tense, nor, in fact, does it readily occur
as a direct object. The preferred position of generics of this
type in English seems to be the subject position. "The newspaper
of today is larger and more informative than the newspaper of 30
years ago," seems to be quite acceptable, while "People aren't
reading the newspaper of today as much as they did the newspaper
of 30 years ago," seems less acceptable. Stylistics may play a
role here too, of course, but any further analysis along these
lines would lead us too far afield.

10. The examples used in this paragraph are taken from, or
based on sentences found in Koutsoudas (1968a:4).

11. Since there are four readily movable syntactic elements
in these sentences, namely, three noun phrases and a verb, there
are naturally other combinations possible in addition to the six
given here. These other possible constructions reflect differ-
ences in emphasis and add no more essential information to the —
matter at hand than the above examples. However, since a knowl-
edge of stress and word-order phenomena are crucial for a fuller
understanding of Hungarian, such variations will be discussed
quite extensively in Chapter XVIII.

CHAPTER V

ANAPHORIC DEFINITE PERSONAL PRONOUNS

5.0 Introduction

The place of pronouns within the category of definiteness
has never been clearly defined, to my knowledge, for either En-
glish or Hungarian. For the most part the connections made be-
tween pronoun usage and definitization have been only marginal.[1]
We have previously cited a statement (Fillmore 1964:96) to the
effect that "definite pronouns" are not attached to restrictive
clauses in English. However, the question as to what pronouns
are "definite" is not answered, this being beside the main point
being discussed in the article cited. Nor, of course, are the
corollary questions that follow answered: 1) What pronouns are
indefinite? 2) What is the structural significance of such a
categorization of the pronouns? and 3) What, in short, is the
place of pronouns in the broad category of definiteness? These
questions will be dealt with from the point of view of English
first of all, then from the Hungarian standpoint by way of con-
trast. Accordingly, we will attempt to answer the latter all-
embracing question by drawing together relevant items of infor-
mation relating to English pronominalization and definitization,
by expanding on them wherever necessary, then relating these
findings to the parallel situations in Hungarian. A useful pro-
cedure here, I believe, would be to view pronominal forms of all
kinds in the light of what we have already said is the fundamen-
tal basis of the broad structural category of definiteness, and
thus to determine the definite or indefinite status of each pro-
noun type. We shall proceed by determining, if we can, what

makes definite pronouns definite and conclude by outlining the structural consequences of such definitization. Now that we have determined what the essential elements relating to the process of the definitization of a noun phrase are, it would seem to be a relatively simple matter to apply this yardstick in investigating the definitization of pronouns, inasmuch as the standard definition of pronoun includes the fact that this form class "is used as a substitute for a noun or noun equivalent."[2] By using, then, the criterion that a noun phrase is made definite through mention in prior discourse or through the broad "context," i.e., the entire situation in which the discourse is taking place, we may now test various types of pronouns to determine their relationship to definiteness and their concomitant patterning with other elements in the discourse.

5.1 Anaphoric pronouns

In paragraph 4.1.2 what we had labelled "the optional use of the definite article after previous mention" is actually the anaphoric use of a pronoun, that is, the (optional) replacement of an entire noun phrase by a single form traditionally called a "pronoun," a "definite pronoun" in this case, inasmuch as the definite noun phrase or its replacement represents the totality of the referent. We said further that, if there is no ambiguity in the discourse context, that is, if there is only one referent in the prior discourse to which an anaphoric pronoun may "logically" or grammatically refer, then the pronominalization is more or less obligatory in the spoken standard in English, while in parallel constructions in Hungarian the total noun phrase deletion coupled with the absence of the pronoun is the rule in

non-contrastive, non-emphatic sentences. Consider again the examples given in the paragraph cited above:

  a. 1. I talked to a pretty woman yesterday. The woman told me a sad story.
    2. I talked to a pretty woman yesterday. She told me a sad story.

  b. 1. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. A nő elmondott egy szomorú történetet.
    2. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. Ő elmondott egy szomorú történetet.
    3. Egy csinos nővel beszéltem tegnap. Elmondott egy szomorú történetet.

There can be little doubt that <u>she</u> (together with its Hungarian equivalent) is a "definite (and <u>total</u>) pronoun,"[3] since it directly replaces a clearly definite noun phrase.[4] Native speakers apprehend that <u>she</u> is as definite as <u>the</u> <u>woman</u> in such a discourse situation. However, to test the definiteness of such a pronoun as <u>she</u> by other means is rather difficult. Applying, for example, the structural criterion of collocatability with restrictive or non-restrictive relative clauses leads us no further in this test since pronouns of the total-anaphoric type do not seem to pattern with either type of relative clause, not even a repetitive one which reiterates the identifying context of the prior discourse.[5]

 5.1.1 <u>Hungarian</u> <u>anaphoric</u> <u>pronouns</u> <u>or</u> <u>their</u> <u>substitutes</u> <u>as</u> <u>subjects</u>. In 4.1.2 above we gave several examples which indicate that in many respects the employment of an anaphoric pronoun in Hungarian--in subject position at least--is quite similar to the corresponding process in English, with the additional factor that Hungarian has the option of deleting the pronoun in non-ambiguous, non-emphatic contexts. Accordingly, the English sentence a.1 has two common equivalents in Hungarian:

a. 1. She (or he) told me a sad story.
            2. Ő elmondott nekem egy szomorú történetet.
            3. Elmondott nekem egy szomorú történetet.

Similarly: b. 1. They were very interesting. (i.e., the men)
            2. Ők nagyon érdekesek voltak. (also azok)
            3. Nagyon érdekesek voltak.

and with "neuter," i.e., non-personal reference:

         c. 1. It was new. (i.e., the table)
            2. Az új volt.
            3. Új volt.

         d. 1. They are quite new. (e.g., the tables)
            2. Azok elég újak.
            3. ?Elég újak.

The last Hungarian sentence is marked "questionable." Since
equational sentences already call for a deletion, namely, the
copula, when the subject is in the third person, deleting the
subject in addition, as in this example, is felt to be too much
truncation. However, apart from the fact, then, that Hungarian
grammar (inconsistently) distinguishes only personal vs. non-
personal gender in the third person singular and plural, while
English has a three-way gender distinction in the singular but
none in the plural, the main point of difference in anaphoric
subject pronouns in the two languages is the fact that the pro-
noun in Hungarian is largely optional since--as in Spanish and
many other languages--the verb is unambiguously conjugated for
person and number. Therefore, the structural possibilities for
testing the status of definiteness of a Hungarian subject pronoun
are considerably reduced. We have already seen that in Hungarian
"definite" noun phrases cannot be tested for scale of definiteness
by the touchstone of collocatability with relative clauses since
there is no apparent distinction between restrictive and non-re-
strictive clauses, total or partial reference in that language
being signaled by the determiner before the definitized noun

phrase. Accordingly, one would expect at least a change in pro-
noun form to signal, when necessary, the difference between to-
tal definite and partial definite pronouns. Such is the case.
First of all, this "difference in form" may be zero, that is,
the very absence of a possible anaphoric pronoun in Hungarian
is a signal that (unemphatic) total reference is meant.[6] This
is necessarily so with singular reference, of course, and is,
by convention, true for the plural also:

> e. 1. He was very intelligent.
>   2. Nagyon intelligens volt.
>
> f. 1. They are very intelligent and interesting.
>   2. Nagyon intelligensek és érdekesek.

By convention, then, the anaphoric pronouns are not deleted un-
less unemphatic total-definite reference is intended. Speaker
and hearer know exactly who or what is being referred to, once
the introductory statement has been made. Emphatic (or con-
trastive) total reference, however, must be signaled by the em-
ployment of the overt anaphoric pronoun ő in the singular or by
various emphatic total forms in the plural:

> g. 1. She is very intelligent.
>   2. Ő nagyon intelligens.
>
> h. 1. They are all very interesting.
>   2. Mindnyájan nagyon érdekesek.

Partial reference, on the other hand, as in English must be shown
by a change in form other than zero:

> i. 1. Those who were intelligent were interesting.
>   2. Azok, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek (is)
>   voltak.

Other construction types are possible, of course, which convey
the same indications of partial reference in addition to the
"principal" lexical information of the sentence:

j. 1. Some (of them) were intelligent and interesting.
   2. Valamelyikük intelligensek és érdekesek voltak.

We can see from the sentences in e. and f. that while patterning
with relative clauses is not possible with the total-anaphoric
pronouns in either language under discussion here, it is possible
with partial-anaphoric ("partial-definite") pronouns in either
language. This does require a change in pronoun form, however,
in addition to the ability to pattern in this way. We can see
that the same Hungarian form, azok, is a marker of partial defi-
niteness in both noun phrase and pronoun constructions, while in
English those may be employed in parallel constructions. Up to
this point, then, the structural test for definiteness of Hun-
garian anaphoric pronouns used as subjects is, in a sense, nega-
tive, i.e., the pronouns may be deleted if they represent the
totality of the referent, or they may be replaced by other con-
ventional forms, if they do not. Hungarian, however, has still
another structural correlate which indicates clearly the definite
status of anaphoric pronouns which are used as direct objects,
namely the patterning with the definite conjugation. We shall
now proceed to examine this grammatical occurrence more closely.

5.1.2 Hungarian total anaphoric pronouns or substitutes as
direct objects. As we have previously mentioned, definite noun
phrases used as direct objects in Hungarian require the use of
the definite conjugation. It follows then that total anaphoric
pronouns which replace definite noun phrases also govern the def-
inite conjugation. However, just as in the case of the subject
pronouns, the use of the total-definite object pronouns in Hun-
garian is confined largely to emphatic or contrastive utterances
since the verb form is now unambiguously marked for definiteness

of object. Also as in the case of the Hungarian subject pronouns which we have dealt with above, we may go directly from an indefinite noun phrase referent to zero as object, or from a definite one, or one could conceivably observe a discourse situation in which the definitization proceeds from an indefinite noun phrase through all the intermediate stages of definitization, pronominalization, and reduction:

a. 1. (Speaker A) Látok egy embert.   I see a man.
   2. (B) Én is látom az embert.   I see the man too.
   3. (A) Öt nem ismerem.   I don't know him.
   4. (B) Én sem ismerem.   I don't know him
                                               either.

Other dialogs of this type may be "more natural" with either one of the intermediate steps illustrated in a.2 and a.3 omitted. However, the above sentences illustrate fairly accurately the maximum number of steps which may be taken in this process. A "more natural" sequence of definitization shows a direct transition from an indefinite or definite noun phrase to a deleted total "pronoun" object:

b. 1. Látok egy embert, de nem ismerem.
   2. I see a man, but I don't know him.

c. 1. Már megkóstoltad a kávét?
   2. Igen, de nem szeretem.
   3. Did you taste the coffee yet?
   4. Yes, but I don't like it.

Further reductions are also possible in a more explicit or basic type of discourse, in which case English may also delete the object pronoun, but only if accompanied by the main verb:

d. 1. Szereted a kávét?
   2. (Igen), szeretem.
   3. Do you like the coffee?   (or: Do you like coffee?)
   4. Yes, I do (like it).

These and similar reductions are extensive enough to warrant a fuller discussion which will have to be deferred at this time.

5.2 Contrasts in anaphoric pronoun usage

Having once formulated the hypothesis that there is a syn-
tactic feature of totality that pervades the whole category of
definiteness in both English and Hungarian, we may now test this
hypothesis with anaphoric pronouns in order to determine what
syntactic or formal correlates, if any, are associated with tot-
ality of referent in contrast to partial reference. We have in-
dicated in several places above that if an indefinite noun phrase
has a singular referent, then the definite pronoun "replacing"
it must, of necessity, be "total-anaphoric." When, on the other
hand, there is a discourse referent which includes more than one
item, then the possible contrast between totality and partiality
is, in turn, an all-pervading and indispensable factor in the
category of definiteness. Accordingly, the following sentences,
which contain plural or collective referents, may serve to il-
lustrate the role of totality as concerns anaphoric object pro-
nouns in both of the languages being discussed here:

a. 1. There are (some) cups on the kitchen table.
   2. Please bring them to me.
   3. Csészék vannak a konyhaasztalon. (or: Néhány
                                              csésze van ...)
   4. Kérlek hozd ide nekem (azokat).

b. 1. Please bring me one (of them). (or: ... one of
                                         them to me.)
   2. Kérlek hozz ide egyet belőle/belőluk.

c. 1. Please bring some (of them) to me. (or: ... me
                                            some.)
   2. Kérlek hozz néhányat belőle/belőlük.

In the above examples we see illustrated an important feature of
anaphoric pronoun usage in Hungarian, namely, that the deletion
of the definite pronoun in Hungarian is the rule when all of the
referent is being referred to in subsequent discourse, the defi-
niteness of the object being clearly marked by the definite

conjugation endings. When part of the referent is being re-
ferred to, then a partial-anaphoric pronoun, for example, egy or
valamennyi, is employed in conjunction with the indefinite con-
jugation. In addition to the foregoing specific observation,
the sample sentences above offer an illustration of the general
ability of the difference in the sets of conjugational endings
alone to furnish the contrast necessary in Hungarian for differ-
entiating between totality and partiality of reference. This
contrastive ability is clearly exemplified in the use of the
anaphoric pronoun valamennyi, which is ambiguous, its full mean-
ing being dependent on the conjugation type with which it occurs.
As an object of a verb in the indefinite conjugation, as in 2.c
above, valamennyi is a partial-anaphoric (or, traditionally,
"indefinite") pronoun; as an object of a verb with definite end-
ings, it is a total-anaphoric (or "definite") pronoun. Thus, a
contrast in meaning shown by conjugational endings alone is quite
simple to illustrate with this anaphoric pronoun:

       d. 1. Hozd ide valamennyit (nekem).
          2. Bring them (all) to me.

       e. 1. Hozzál ide valamennyit (nekem).
          2. Bring some (of them) to me.

1.   The only exception to this statement that I know of is Postal (1966), where it is argued that definite pronouns are actually definite articles.

2.   <u>Webster's</u> <u>Third</u> <u>New</u> <u>International</u> <u>Dictionary</u>, page 1816 b-c. Whether the structurally ambiguous part of this definition is to be read as "... or for a noun equivalent" or "... or as a noun equivalent" makes little difference in our analysis here.

3.   In our discussion here of previous mention or previous-mention "replacement" we are, of course, not ruling out the fact that such pronouns as <u>she</u> may be also situationally identified. It is not difficult to think of a situation, for example, where <u>she</u> is actually deictic, that is to say, replaces a demonstrative in such a sentence as "That woman dances well," spoken by a person pointing to an individual on a dance floor. "She dances well" would be equally well understood in such a situation, even without prior discourse of any kind. The same applies to the form <u>she</u> which is employed to designate a non-human object to which a personal attachment may be felt. For example, "She's a good ship" and "How's she running?" uttered in the presence of a ship and an automobile, respectively, are perfectly acceptable introductory sentences in a discourse. The <u>she</u> of "There she goes!" may be multiply ambiguous, the discourse situation clearly indicating whether someone or something is passing by, or whether a house is collapsing or what not. Except for this brief mention, such "marginal" forms as the above will have to be left out of consideration here. Although only nominative forms of the pronouns will be given here in these examples, what is said in regard to definiteness of pronouns applies, of course, to all case forms of the pronoun in question.

4.   I use the traditional term <u>replaces</u> in spite of Postal's flippant comment (1966:198-9): "The idea that a form like <u>she</u> in sentences such as <u>she</u> <u>dances</u> <u>well</u> is a 'replacement' or 'substitute' for some other noun, say in 'discourse contexts' or the like, seems to me completely without basis. Such an assumption explains nothing for the quite simple reason that there is nothing to explain. It is quite sufficient to indicate precisely that such forms refer to object-types whose particular referents are assumed by the speaker to be known to the person spoken to." The latter sentence of this quotation sounds like my own definition of <u>situational</u> <u>identification</u>. However, when in a particular utterance the form <u>a</u> <u>woman</u>, for example, is introduced into the discourse, and this is followed by occurrences of <u>she</u>, understood by speaker and hearer to refer to the same individual, then it seems this relationship should be stated by the linguist.

5.   There is no doubt that in some literary styles <u>he</u> and the other "definite" pronouns of the third person can indeed pattern with relative clauses. This is particularly true in regard to older translations of the Bible, but this phenomenon is common in other types of writing as well. Typical biblical quotations

93

are: "And he who saw it has borne witness, and his witness is true" (John 19,35); and "... and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband" (John 4,18). An example from expository prose is 'Talking is often just a game, but a game is only worthwhile if he who plays the game sticks to the rules" (Martinet 1962:139). The last occurrence of he here is, strictly speaking, an example of "indefinite" he who, which is the equivalent of whoever or anyone who. The first two instances, on the other hand, are partial anaphoric and equivalent to the one who.

6. "Impersonal" verbs in Hungarian as, for example, esik, 'it's raining,' dörög, 'it's thundering,' etc., also have a zero subject, of course. These verbs, however, may be analyzed as "indefinite" for semantic reasons, if for no other reason.

CHAPTER VI

NON-ANAPHORIC DEFINITE PERSONAL PRONOUNS

6.0 Introduction

As discussed above, anaphoric pronouns are, by definition, of the third person, inasmuch as they replace a previously-mentioned noun phrase. It was also stated that if such a pronoun represents the totality of the referent, then the anaphoric pronoun is "definite;" if, on the other hand, it represents only part of the entities included in the antecedent, then it is a "partial-definite" pronoun, which traditionally has been lumped together with "indefinite" pronouns. It follows then that the pronouns of the first and second persons are not anaphoric since they obviously do not replace any previously-mentioned noun phrase. Consequently, neither the traditional label "pronoun" nor the structural label "substitution type" is appropriate, strictly speaking. However, if we leave terminological questions aside and continue to use the traditional terms, it still remains to be examined how these pronouns come to be definite, if indeed they are definite in English or Hungarian.

6.1 English pronouns of the first and second person

As we examine the English forms, it would be very tempting, indeed, to label the non-anaphoric pronouns I, we and you "proper nouns" since they--within a given utterance, of course--fit the dictionary definition of this noun type: "A noun that designates a particular being or thing, does not take a limiting modifier and is usu. capitalized in English" (Webster's Third New International Dictionary:1818). The pronoun I, of course, fits this

definition on all three accounts, but when one applies the structural test of collocatability with restrictive clauses, it becomes quite apparent that the first person singular pronoun does not (?) pattern with either a restrictive or a non-restrictive clause, which is not true of traditional proper nouns, or of indefinite pronouns, for that matter. Thus while a.1 below is possible, a.2 is unacceptable, while a.3 is doubtful:

a. 1. Mary Smith, who is a friend of mine, will be there.
   2. *I, who am her friend, will be there.
   3. ?I who am her friend will be there.

If one finds a.3 unacceptable--as I do--then one can conclude that I is definite, as definite, structurally speaking, as the traditionally recognized definite pronouns of the third person, even though it cannot be a substitute for a previously-mentioned noun phrase. If a.3 is acceptable, then I is as indefinite structurally as someone, something and other independent indefinite pronouns. This leaves us with an anomaly, of course, for there is hardly any other linguistic form which could be considered to be "more definite" through situational identification, even though one recognizes the fact that this pronoun can have an unstable referent from one sentence to the next. However, for each sentence uttered, speaker and hearer obviously know what individual is the referent for each given occurrence of the pronoun. Since I is singular, it is necessarily "total;" consequently, no question of partiality vs. totality can arise. However, in the case of we and you, there is, of course, room for ambiguity in this regard. For one thing, patterning with non-restrictive or restrictive clauses seems to be possible in standard English. Patterning with restrictive clauses, of course, implies a contrast with other persons not included in the qualification. This

is the partitive relation once again, as can be seen from the following:

> b. 1. You, who are my friends, will understand this.
>   2. You who are my friends understand me.

There are, of course, numerous instances where speakers do not employ differences in clause type to show contrast or unambiguity in number reference, and it is interesting to observe what devices are employed in English to resolve or prevent such ambiguity, which, as is well known, does not arise in many languages, because of the greater variety of pronominal forms. It is, for example, a well-known fact that, while English and Hungarian possess only one first plural subject pronoun form, other languages may employ an "exclusive" or "inclusive" form, or a dual or trial number, etc., concepts which may easily be paraphrased in English or Hungarian when speakers feel such a distinction is necessary. The "inclusive" first person plural, for example, may be merely replaced in English by you and I (both), while we both, we two, we three, the two of us, etc., may be less ambiguous in a given discourse situation than the unsupported pronoun. Other types of reinforcement (or qualification) are possible, of course. A very frequent type is we + noun, usually in overt contradistinction to you + noun, we Americans vs. you Frenchmen, for example, (but not *they Germans, and the like). However, it seems that no matter how the first person plural pronoun form is reinforced (or qualified), it still patterns as either definite or indefinite by the structural measures employed here, for example:

> c. 1. We, (who are) the best chess players in the USA,
>   should be able to beat this boy.
>   2. We who have tickets are lucky.

The latter sentence is also an example of partial reference from a stated or tacitly understood totality. It is further quite evident that many native speakers of English are conscientiously aware of the number ambiguity of the second person pronouns, which, of course, does not arise in many other languages, because of available plural forms. This is clearly evidenced by the widespread use of such forms as you all (y'all), you folks, you people, etc., employed as unambiguous plural forms. Likewise, attitudes of endearment and the like, on the one hand, and scorn and the like on the other, both of which are possible to express in other languages through the selection of "familiar" forms of address in contrast to "formal" types, may be expressed by reinforcing elements in English, if the need is felt: you dear, you genius, etc., on the one hand, vs. you fool, you dope, etc., on the other. However, just as was the case with we, this type of modification of the second person pronoun in English does not seem to affect the structural status of the pronoun, which must, accordingly, be considered to be "total definite," through situational identification if there is no qualification present to imply partial reference. It will be noted that this is the same syntactic behavior exhibited by common nouns in this regard. However, this parallelism cannot be carried too far.

6.2 First and "second" person pronouns in Hungarian

The situation with regard to the first and "second" person pronoun forms in Hungarian is even more complicated, for there is not only differentiation in number or social status, and the like, but also anomalies in grammatical person, and in definiteness as well. These are in addition to the fact discussed above

that Hungarian pronominal forms--both subject and object forms--
tend to be deleted in unambiguous, non-emphatic utterances.

6.2.1 _Familiar forms._ The semantic (or social) implications
of the second person "familiar" forms in Hungarian need not con-
cern us here at the moment, since the various "meanings" of these
forms do not seem to affect their structural status, which is
what we shall now proceed to examine. Although they are non-ana-
phoric, the subject forms, _te_ and _ti_, seem to have the same syn-
tactic properties as the definite pronouns which we have previ-
ously examined; that is, they show the same behavior with re-
spect to occurrence with restrictive clauses and to possibilities
for deletion. The object forms of these second person pronouns--
as well as those of the first person--on the other hand, behave
differently from the third person forms in regard to their status
in the category of definiteness. The object forms of the first
and second persons, _engem(et)_, _minket/benünket_, and _téged(et)_,
titeket/benneteket, respectively, govern the indefinite, not the
definite conjugation, as indicated in the following paradigm:

```
          a. Pista látja őt.        Steve sees him.
but:      b. Pista lát engem.       Steve sees me.
and       c. Pista lát téged.       Steve sees you.
just as   d. Pista lát valakit.     Steve sees someone.
```

Since the plural forms of these pronouns behave in the same fash-
ion as their respective singulars, the paradigm need not be ex-
tended to include them. The question remains, however, as to how
one is to explain this divergent behavior of the first and second
person pronouns. Some of the analytic difficulty may be resolved
by simply stating that these pronouns are indefinite in their
subject forms as well as in their object forms, although this
would be difficult to demonstrate by our structural tests. The

other discrepancy, that of the indefiniteness of the first and second person forms vs. the definiteness of the third, is also difficult to account for synchronically, but may be analyzed transformationally by the simple statement embodied in an ordering rule valid for object pronouns, at least: Definitization precedes pronominalization. Therefore, a sequence such as in e. is required (at least hypothetically):

e. 1. Egy ember megy.   A man is going.
   2. Pista látja az embert.   Steve sees the man.
   3. Pista látja őt.   Steve sees him.
or: 4. Pista látja.   Steve sees him.

This sequence can apply, of course, only to third person forms, since the first and second persons, by definition, have no noun phrase referents in prior discourse which can be made definite or pronominalized. Postulating a sequence such as the above, however, does not explain why the subject forms of the first and second persons seem to behave the same way structurally as the third person forms, unless, of course, one were to regard the occurrence before various verb forms appended with different (i.e., non-third person) personal suffixes as sufficient motivation for stating that all of the subject personal pronouns behave differently from each other syntactically--even in regard to the category of definiteness. However, there is much to be said for treating the first and second person pronouns together as belonging to a syntactic category different from that of the third person pronouns. In other words, the syntactic opposition is between the singular first or second person pronoun--patterning with various personal verbal suffixes--on the one hand, and the third person--with zero in the indefinite conjugation, at least--on the other, the situation in the plural being considered an analogical

100

extension of this phenomenon. Zero verbal suffix and zero pro-
noun subject are possible, then, only in those situations where
the subjects are anaphoric (or, of course, clearly deictic). In
other situations the suffixes of the first or second persons will
perforce be employed.[1] The same sort of rule prevails, then,
with the object pronouns of the first and second person singular,
engem(et) and téged(et); in this case, however, the endings of
the different conjugation types mark the anaphoric or non-ana-
phoric nature of the deleted pronoun object. Thus, the definite
object + zero object can be employed anaphorically only,[2] that
is, with a third-person referent already having been mentioned.
Conversely, the indefinite conjugation + zero object marks the
deletion of first or second person pronoun forms, the discourse
situation clearly indicating which person is meant (otherwise
the unambiguous object pronoun forms are necessarily used). In
this manner, then, a whole array of unambiguous subject and ob-
ject pronoun deletions are possible, depending on the discourse
situation, in which the anaphoric or non-anaphoric nature of the
deleted forms is known. A paradigm illustrating this will be
given after the following discussion of the "implicative" forms.

6.2.1.1 Forms denoting "I subject - you object." A much-
discussed non-anaphoric deletion of both subject pronoun and ob-
ject pronoun is found in the use of the "implicative"[3] (-lak/-lek)
forms. This portmanteau suffix indicates a first person singu-
lar subject and a second person "familiar" object, either singu-
lar or plural. The singular object is marked in this particular
case by this unique suffix plus zero, the plural by the same suf-
fix plus the second person plural object pronoun. The use of

this incorporating suffix is another example of unambiguous ob-
ject deletion or the use of zero in non-emphatic or non-contras-
tive utterances, since in situations requiring emphasis of some
kind, the proper object (or even subject) pronoun may be used
as an intensifier. Thus, a discourse may be unambiguously ini-
tiated with, for example, this non-anaphoric form: Szeretlek
'I love you.' Furthermore, since, as we have seen, the use of
the indefinite conjugational endings with zero object clearly
indicates the deletion of a non-third person object form, the
obverse subject-object relation may be unambiguously expressed
by the verb alone with both subject and object pronouns deleted.
Thus, a discourse may be initiated with simply a verb form such
as Szeretsz? 'Do you love me?' since the second-person subject
verbal suffix is unambiguous, and the use of the indefinite con-
jugation + zero clearly indicates that a non-third person (non-
reflexive) object form has been deleted. In fact, as previously
indicated, the overt use of a personal pronoun in such unambigu-
ous instances does imply emphasis, deletion being more common in
non-emphatic discourse, for example::

      a. 1. Szeretsz?   Do you love me?
         2. Igen, szeretlek. Yes, I do.

A great deal has been written in regard to the actual place of
the -lak/-lek suffix in the Hungarian conjugational system, and
although there is at least one pedagogical grammar of Hungarian
which takes no stand on the issue,[4] the usual grammar labels
-lak/-lek as a special suffix of the definite conjugation. With-
out getting too involved in this (mainly terminological) question
here, it might be mentioned that both from the morphological as
well as from the syntactic point of view it is difficult to

understand the motivation behind the notion that this suffix be-
longs in the definite conjugation. The contrary view has been,
in my opinion, definitively presented in at least two formal ar-
ticles (Lotz 1962 and Keresztes 1965) which require no further
elaboration here. It should be pointed out here, however, that
just as the definite conjugation does not occur with a second-
person object, neither does the regular indefinite conjugational
form of the first person singular occur with a second person form
as sole object either:

       b. 1. *Janos teged(et) latja.   John sees you.
          2. *En teged(et) latom.   I see you.

       c, 1. *En teged(et) latok.   I see you.
          2. *En titeket latok.   I see you (pl.).

6.2.1.2 <u>Possible deletions of first and second person ob-
ject pronouns</u>. We briefly indicated above that the contrast in
Hungarian conjugational endings alone is exploited to indicate
the person of the object in perhaps most utterances in connected
discourse. The skeletal dialog given above: "Szeretsz? Szeret-
lek." is but the briefest example of an almost endless variety of
possible discourse situations in which the situation itself
clearly indicates whether the speaker or hearer is meant as the
object of the transitive verb with indefinite endings but with
no overt object. This includes, of course, verbs with either
second or third person endings in the case of the first person
object, and first person (plural) and third person endings in
the case of the second.[5] Thus, narrative sentences such as:

       a. 1. Pista nyitott ajtót, és örömmel udvözölt.
          2. Steve opened the door and greeted (me) happily.

can "logically" have only a first person object, the prior con-
text supplying the information necessary for precluding the

interpretation of a second person object. Similarly, the common formula "Hogy hívnak?" may, of course, have either a first or second person as object of the verb. However, the discourse situation in which the formula occurs clearly indicates whether or not the remote possibility of a first person object is intended. An unambiguous deletion of the first person object pronoun engem may naturally follow a previous occurrence of the pronoun, as in the line from a Hungarian folksong:

> b. 1. Öleljen meg engem, aki szeret. (Bánhidi et al.
> 1965:199)
> 2. Hug me, whoever loves (me).

Finally, it must be mentioned that such deletions may be perfectly clear as to person, but may be ambiguous as to number. This ambiguity may be resolved by the use of the appropriate object pronoun, of course, but need not be, as in certain instances the notion of number is unimportant:

> c. 1. Holnap meglátogathatnál. (Báti and Véges
> 1966:251)
> 2. You might come to visit me/us tomorrow.

6.2.2 "Formal" forms of address. The discussion above relating to the "second person" pronouns had to do with clear-cut cases of "semantic" as well as "grammatical" second person, i.e., with both distinctive pronoun forms as well as verbal suffixes employed when addressing one's "familiar" hearer(s). What was not included in the discussion was the phenomenon of "polite" or "formal" forms of address in Hungarian, which for a variety of structural reasons must be analyzed as third person, even though one traditionally tends to label as "second person" those pronominal forms associated with the person(s) addressed regardless of the structural implications involved in such

classification. Thus, <u>maga</u> and <u>ön</u>, and their plural forms,
<u>maguk</u> and <u>önök</u> show third-person characteristics when considered
from at least the following points of view.

6.2.2.1 <u>Morphological considerations</u>. The first obvious
point in the consideration of the place of <u>maga</u> and <u>ön</u> in the
grammatical system of Hungarian is the fact that these forms
morphologically behave as nouns, <u>maga</u> having the characteristics
of a noun in the possessive, <u>ön</u> those of a common noun stem.
Therefore, while the "familiar" second person nominative and ac-
cusative pronouns (as well as the first person forms) synchroni-
cally form their plurals by suppletion: <u>te/ti</u>, <u>téged/titeket</u> or
<u>benneteket</u> (also <u>én/mi</u>, <u>engem/minket</u> or <u>bennünket</u>), the formal
forms--as well as the third person pronoun <u>ő</u>--undergo pluraliza-
tion by regular substantival suffixation: <u>maga/maguk</u>,[6] <u>ön/önök</u>.
Furthermore, as is well known, these latter forms as subjects
take the same personal verbal suffixes as other nouns, common or
proper:

	a. 1.	Maga (or Ön) elmegy holnap.	You are leaving tomorrow.
Just as:	2.	Pista elmegy holnap.	Steve is leaving tomorrow.
	3.	A lány elmegy holnap.	The girl is leaving tomorrow.

Other (syntactically-motivated) morphological considerations re-
lating to the "polite" forms will be discussed below in the sec-
tion on reflexives.

6.2.2.2 <u>Syntactic considerations</u>. One important syntactic
consideration relating to the formal forms which must be consid-
ered is the fact that, unlike the familiar form <u>te</u>, <u>maga</u> and <u>ön</u>
are, in some measure, anaphoric as they can replace formal address

forms consisting of, for example, occupational titles, in addition
to other social forms, such as <u>tanár úr</u> (lit.) 'Mr. Teacher,'
<u>igazgató úr</u> 'Mr. Director' and the like. These forms, of course,
require third-person subject-object agreement, just as any other
third-person form, and govern the definite conjugation when used
as the direct object. Accordingly, we may have a three-way
choice of polite forms of address ranging from noun phrase to pro-
noun to zero, just as in the case of pronominalization occurring
with any other noun phrase:

a. 1. <u>Tanár úr</u> le tetszik ülni?	Would you care to sit down, profes-sor?
2. <u>Önnek</u> le tetszik ülni?	Would you care to sit down?
3. Le tetszik ülni?	Would you care to sit down?

The same range of choices is open, of course, in instances where
the polite forms are direct objects:

b. 1. Tanár urat hall<u>om</u>.	I hear you, professor.
2. Önt hall<u>om</u>.	I hear you (sir).
3. Hall<u>om</u>.	I hear you.

6.2.2.3 <u>Sociological considerations for deletions</u>. Be-
cause of the fact that the proper selection of an appropriate
form of address often poses an unsolvable social dilemma in some
instances in Hungarian, a common practice in more formal conver-
sational situations is to avoid, as much as possible, the use of
a pronoun altogether. This can be readily achieved by the use
of the third person verbal suffixes with zero in the case of
"formal" subject, and the definite conjugation with zero in
cases where the formal form is the object. It is obvious, then,
that in the use of the definite conjugation with zero object,
the ambiguity which results is between the formal forms and a

definite object of the traditional third person. This is in
contrast to the ambiguity in the use of the indefinite conjuga-
tion and zero, the ambiguity arising in this instance between
the first and second person objects. For example, while we have
seen that the formula "Hogy hívnak" may possibly have either a
first or second person object, the definite form of the same for-
mula limits the number of possible objects to either "third per-
son" or "formal." Thus, "Hogy hívják" translates into "What is
your name?" or any other third person possibility: "What is
his/her/their name(s)?" However, since, as we have seen, such a
deletion of the third person object generally takes place only
when the object is total anaphoric, that is, only when there is
a previously-mentioned referent in mind, there is in actual prac-
tice comparatively little ambiguity occurring in regular dis-
course. Extensive conversations are carried out quite successful-
ly with the use of the non-committal "zero form of address" in
the place of an overt, possibly awkward form of address.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. The impersonal verbs alluded to in footnote six of the previous chapter again form an exception to this statement.

2. Actually, the pronouns maga and ön may be "understood" in certain instances. These pronouns and their plural forms will be discussed below, and will be treated as third-person forms, since, among other things, they can be anaphoric in a sense, and also govern third-person verbal forms, and not the second-person ones.

3. This term was coined by Lotz (1962).

4. Bánhidi et al. (1965:194) simply call this suffix "a special verb form."

5. Third-person objects may be deleted after verbs in the indefinite conjugation also, but these are partial-anaphoric, i.e., partitives, and will be discussed further below in 6.2.2.2.

6. Maguk, of course, is marked for plural possessor, and not plural possessed.

CHAPTER VII

REFLEXIVE AND DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

7.0 Introduction

The reflexive pronouns in both of the languages being ana-
lyzed here pose a special problem in that they have the charac-
teristics of nouns and anaphoric pronouns at the same time. In
addition, they pattern as clear-cut definite pronouns in all per-
sons, even though, as was shown above, the first and second per-
son object pronouns at least are considered indefinite in Hungar-
ian by the structural test of government of the definite conju-
gation just as do indefinite noun phrases or indefinite pronouns.
The demonstrative pronouns, on the other hand, pose problems be-
cause of the varying patterning in Hungarian, and because of the
extensive uses of the English forms. We shall examine each type
separately here.

7.1 Reflexive pronouns

Upon examining the morphological structure of the reflexive
pronouns in both English and Hungarian, one is struck by the fact
that these "pronouns" are actually nouns, possessive nouns in
fact, which are used in special ways. The English forms, for
example, form a fairly complete possessive paradigm in most stand-
ard forms: myself, yourself, herself, ourselves, and yourselves.
Itself is undoubtedly a reduction of its + self, while the sub-
standard analogical formations hisself and theirselves clearly
indicate that the formal correlation between the reflexive and
possessive forms is strongly felt by many native speakers of Eng-
lish. Furthermore, as Postal pointed out (1966:182), the form

<u>self</u> can occur both free or as a stem with noun suffixes, e.g.,
-<u>less</u> and -<u>ish</u>. The Hungarian reflexive forms likewise exhibit
noun endings, the endings of its paradigm being almost isomorphic
with the possessive endings on back-vowel nouns, <u>ház</u> 'house,' for
example:

	reflexive		possessive	
1.	magam	'myself,' etc.	házam	'my house,' etc.
2.	magad	-	házad	
3.	maga		háza	
1.	magunk		házunk	
2.	magatok		házotok	
3.	maguk		házuk	

Since the reflexive pronouns in Hungarian are, morphologically
speaking, possessive nouns, their definiteness may be explained
in the same manner that the definiteness of possessive nouns in
general is analyzed (see Chapter XI). However, there is natural-
ly more to reflexive pronouns than just their noun nature in
either English or Hungarian. This is their status as anaphoric
pronouns, which we shall now proceed to discuss.

7.1.1 <u>Anaphoric nature of reflexives</u>. Although we have
seen that personal pronouns can be anaphoric, i.e., can replace
a previously-mentioned noun phrase, only in the third person by
definition, the reflexive pronouns are anaphoric in all persons
by definition. In fact, they are obligatory replacements of ob-
ject forms whenever the referents of the subject and of the ob-
ject are identical. Thus, a.1 and b.1 are <u>possible</u> only if there
are two identically-named individuals in question, and a.2 and
b.2 are <u>possible</u> only if there are two different (male) beings in
question, while a.3 and b.3 are <u>obligatory</u> if one and the same
individual is meant as subject and object:[1]

a. 1. John sees John in the mirror.
           2. John sees him in the mirror.
           3. John sees himself in the mirror.

        b. 1. János Jánost látja a tükörben.
           2. János őt látja a tükörben.
           3. János magát látja a tükörben.

By convention, then, the first two sentences in each group are
"ungrammatical" if the same individual is meant as both subject
and object. This phenomenon parallels the obligatory definiti-
zation in subsequent discourse of a noun phrase which has been
previously mentioned or is otherwise identified in the discourse
situation. In both instances "ungrammaticality" is measured by
the effectiveness of communication, that is, by the success of
the speaker in making the proper connection between a previously-
mentioned noun phrase and forms used subsequently to refer to it.
It is in a sense "discourse ungrammaticality" that is being dis-
cussed here, since, taken in isolation, all of the sentences in
a. and b., for example, are grammatical structurally. However,
in respect to "reflexivity," i.e., the identity relation between
the subject and object, only the last sentence in each group con-
veys the proper information and is therefore grammatical in the
sense taken here.

        7.1.2 <u>The definite nature of reflexive pronouns</u>. The defi-
niteness of the English reflexive pronouns seems to follow quite
naturally from the definiteness of the pronouns or noun phrases
they replace. The Hungarian reflexive pronouns, on the other
hand, contrast with their non-reflexive counterparts in that
they <u>all</u> govern the use of the definite conjugation, while, as
we have seen, only the third person personal pronouns--including,
of course, the formal forms of address--do so. In regard to the

definiteness of the Hungarian reflexives, there seem to be three factors working together simultaneously, none of which is sufficient in itself to assure structural definiteness, namely, 1) previous mention, 2) totality (or "identity") and 3) possessiveness. The last-named factor will be discussed more fully in Chapter XI of this work. However, it may be mentioned here that, like previous mention, it requires the reinforcement of the additional factor of totality before definiteness is assured. Totality, of course, is a feature which also requires an additional feature for definiteness to take place, as with the first and second person pronouns in Hungarian or any number of indefinite pronouns in either language, everyone 'mindenki,' for example. As for the first and second person pronouns in Hungarian, these pronouns collocate with the indefinite conjugation because the definite conjugation is restricted to third-person objects, as we have seen. When one considers the reflexive pronouns, however, it becomes quite apparent that, starting from a basic pattern of subject-verb-object, or equally, subject-object-verb, the occurrence of the object form is a type of previous mention if both the subject and the object are identical. This would lead to definiteness through previous mention plus the feature of totality. Thus, while both object pronouns in a. and b. are total, only magadat is both total and anaphoric, hence definite:

    a. 1. János téged lát.
       2. John sees you.

    b. 1. Te magadat látod.
       2. You see yourself.

The same holds true, of course, for all reflexives of the first and second persons, singular and plural.

7.2 Reflexive vs. reciprocal pronouns

It seems that the definiteness of the reciprocal pronouns in both English and Hungarian may be explained by a simple extension of the analysis given above, showing the anaphoric nature of the reflexives. In both languages the reciprocal forms are compounds of elements which are widely-used indefinite pronouns (or determiners). Now it must be admitted that it is often a futile exercise to attempt to decompose compounds in a semantically relevant way, but it is nonetheless quite tempting to assume that the combining of indefinite pronoun with indefinite pronoun to form a definite pronoun is not just an arbitrary juxtaposition of forms. It is a phenomenon made possible by the anaphoric nature of the form resulting from this fusion, chemical analogies with the compounds H_2O and $NaCl$ notwithstanding. Therefore, egymás and its English equivalents one another or each other pattern in their respective languages with the other definite pronouns discussed above because as object forms they refer back to the subject, individually, rather than as a group, as is the case with the other reflexives. While other languages often use the same pronominal form to express both the reflexive and the reciprocal relationships, e.g., German sich and Spanish se, Hungarian and English keep these relationships separate by distinctive pronouns:

a. 1. A fiatalok szeretik magukat. (also önmagukat)
   2. The young people love themselves. -

b. 1. A fiatalok szeretik egymást.
   2. The young people love each other (one another).

It is apparent that the anaphoric relationship plus the feature of totality are sufficient for definitization in the case of both types of pronouns discussed here. . **113**

7.3 Demonstrative pronouns

Each of the so-called "demonstrative" pronouns in both English and Hungarian, this/that and ez/az and their respective inflected forms, is found to have at least two principal uses, deictic and anaphoric, which have a direct bearing on the status of these pronouns in the category of definiteness. We shall discuss these primary uses before proceeding to secondary ones, concentrating our attention on the anaphoric use inasmuch as this has greater ramifications than the first-named use.

7.3.1 The deictic use. The first use of the demonstrative pronouns may be called the "real" demonstrative use, the deictic use, in which the concrete, real-world object being referred to is in sight of the speaker and hearer, and may be singled out by being pointed at, touched, lifted, etc. A demonstrative pronoun used in this way illustrates a case of situational identification par excellence, and, if total, must certainly be analyzed as definite. Several examples of this use will be given here, where the proximity contrasts between ez and az and this and that will be ignored for the time being:[2]

a. 1. What is that? That's an apple tree.
   2. Mi az? Az almafa.

b. 1. I like that.
   2. Azt szeretem.

c. 1. That's a pretty picture.
   2. Az egy szép kép.

In addition to having the feature of totality in regard to reference, these deictic pronouns when unsupported by other pronominal forms do not seem to pattern with relative clauses in English (but see 7.4.3 below), while their Hungarian counterparts

govern the definite conjugation when used as direct objects, as in sentence b.2 above. One aspect of the "deictic" use of the demonstratives which shows important contrasting characteristics between English and Hungarian syntactic possibilities is the fact that, once the identification of the real-world object has been made in the discourse, this and that cannot be used alone as nominals without the support of the pronoun one, while the Hungarian counterpart can freely occur alone, which is, in fact, true of all nominals in Hungarian. The plural forms in English, on the other hand, do follow the Hungarian pattern without a supporting nominal:

    d. 1. This one is bigger than that one. (i.e., this chair, etc.)
       2. Ez nagyobb mint az.

    e. 1. I don't like that one at all.
       2. Ezt egyáltalán nem szeretem.

    f. 1. These are bigger than those.
       2. Ezek nagyobbak mint azok.

    g. 1. ?I don't like this at all. (i.e., this chair)
       2. ?These-ones are quite large.

Strictly speaking, we have here a case of overlapping deictic and anaphoric usage, to which we may give the obvious descriptive label deictic-anaphoric since it is clearly a case of previous mention, while, at the same time, the real-world object is still in sight and is, in fact, usually being pointed to during the discourse. This situation is in obvious contrast on the other end of the scale with pure anaphoric usage--to be discussed more fully below--in which unsupported this and that have only linguistic referents, e.g. "This is what I would say if I were you ..." and "Who said that?"

7.3.2 <u>Anaphoric use</u>. The second use of the pronouns under discussion can hardly be said to be "demonstrative" in its strict sense, since in most instances the referent of the pronoun in question is not a concrete object visibly present in the real world, but is linguistic, that is, some type of noun phrase previously mentioned in the discourse. We will continue to use the term "demonstrative," however, since it is a well-established and convenient cover term for <u>this/that</u> and <u>ez/az</u> in their various uses. As was the case with other examples of previous mention, anaphoric demonstratives may be either total or partial in reference, their status of definiteness depending, as usual, on this important consideration.

7.3.2.1 <u>Total anaphoric demonstratives</u>. Demonstrative pronouns used anaphorically with total reference carry a measure of emphasis in contrast to the other total anaphoric pronouns discussed so far. In such usage English tends to favor <u>that</u> over <u>this</u> (sometimes with <u>it</u> as an alternate), while Hungarian uses <u>az</u> primarily and <u>ez</u> secondarily, both of which pattern with the definite conjugation when used as direct objects in such cases:

a. 1. John wanted to finish the job before noon, but <u>that</u> was impossible.
   2. János a munkát délig be akarta fejezni, de <u>az</u> lehetetlen volt.

b. 1. John says Steve is stupid, but I don't believe <u>that</u>.
   2. János <u>azt</u> mondja, hogy Pista ostoba, de én <u>azt</u> nem hiszem el.

It can be seen that the pronoun <u>that</u> as used in a.1 and b.1 is little more than an emphatic substitute for <u>it</u>, which as a total anaphoric pronoun refers to a noun phrase which may even be an

entire clause. The Hungarian equivalent retains the same form az, the usual anaphoric substitute for such noun phrases which is somewhat emphatic by nature, as we have already seen in its use with restrictive clauses. However, one alternate to az which is possible in many instances of total-anaphoric usage is ez, used in particular when linguistic entities as such (or their total content) are being referred to. The usual "near-far-(ther)" contrast between ez and az seems--from the English point of view--to be overridden, while the corresponding opposition in English seems to be one of (immediate) future vs. just uttered statement, i.e., "what is going to be said" = this; "what has just been said" = that. In the following examples only uses of that will be illustrated:

c. 1. That is my opinion.
   2. Ez a véleményem.

d. 1. That is what he told me.
   2. Ezt mondta nekem. (or: Ez az, amit nekem mondott.)

e. 1. What do you mean by that?
   2. Mit akar ezzel mondani?

As can be seen from the use of the definite conjugation in d.2, ez as a total anaphoric substitute is also treated as definite.

7.3.2.1.1 Emphatic agreement with speaker. The emphatic anaphoric demonstrative that is also used to indicate strong agreement with an opinion uttered by a speaker. In many cases the Hungarian equivalents have az, which actually has a much broader range of usage as a signal of assent. In each of the examples that follow it is assumed that the first utterance is spoken by one speaker, the second utterance by another:

117

a. 1. It was an awful place. That it was!
   2. (Az egy) szörnyű hely Azt meghiszem!
      volt.

b. 1. They are nice fellows. That they are! (They are
                                                 that!)
   2. Remek fiatal emberek! Azt meghiszem. (Valóban
                                                azok!)

c. 1. Will you help me? That I will.
   2. Segítenél nekem?   Azt már igen!

As was hinted above, the Hungarian form az covers most of the
range of anaphoric reference of both it and its stressed counter-
part that. As a relatively unstressed form, az may simply be
used as the affirmative answer to a yes-no question relating
directly to a noun phrase. This gives somewhat greater emphasis
than that achieved by the use of igen, which is otherwise used
as a general equivalent of yes:

d. 1. Ki zongorázik--Feri? Az.
   2. Who's playing the piano--Frank? Yes, (it's him).

or: e. 1. Feri az, aki zongorázik? Az..
           2. Is Frank the one who's playing the piano?
              Yes, (he is).

f. 1. Mi jött be a konyhába--a kutya? Az.
   2. What came into the kitchen--the dog? Yes.

or: g. 1. A kutya az, ami a konyhába jött? Az.
           2. Was it the dog that came into the kitchen?
              Yes, (it was).

In addition to the above instances, az may also be the affirma-
tive response to a question relating to a predicate adjective,
which is considered a nominal in Hungarian, as in h.1 below;
when, however, a predicate adjective appears together with its
subject noun phrase, az must be supported by sentence-modifying
igen in order to resolve the referential ambiguity, as in i.1:

h. 1. Beteg vagy?   Az vagyok.
   2. Are you sick?   Yes, I am. (That I am.)

i. 1. Érdekes az a könyv?   Igen, az.
   2. Is that book interesting? Yes, it is.

It is quite apparent that anaphoric _az_ as shown in the above
examples and _that_, where applicable, are both total in reference
as they each refer back to a previously-mentioned nominal of
some sort which may range from a single form to an entire clause.
They may accordingly be analyzed as definite. In the case of
Hungarian, the definiteness of _az_ in such instances is clearly
indicated by the use of the definite conjugation whenever the
demonstrative is the direct object.

7.3.2.2 _Demonstrative as partial-anaphoric pronoun._ In
direct contrast to the use of the demonstratives in Hungarian as
total anaphoric forms, there are instances where _az_ and its Eng-
lish equivalents (or substitutes where necessary) are used as
partitives, representing either a sub-total amount of some un-
countable item or one of a given class of countable objects:

    a. 1. Pista tejet kap, neked is _az_ kell?[3]
       2. Steve is getting milk. Do you want _some_, too?

    b. 1. Jancsinak biciklit veszek. Én is _azt_ kérek.
       2. I'm buying Johnny a bicycle. _That's_ what I want,
                                         too.
                                   or: I want _one_, too.

As can be seen from the English pronominal equivalents, _az_ used
as a partitive falls into the general category of indefinite and,
when used as a direct object, governs the indefinite conjugation,
as seen from the form _kérek_ in example b.1 above. As we have
discovered in many instances previously, there is otherwise no
structural difference between partial-anaphoric pronouns and in-
definite pronouns, that is, those pronouns which may be used in-
dependently without prior reference or those which have no easily
circumscribed noun phrase as referents. The Hungarian "demon-
strative" _az_ may also be used with indefinite reference, and,

of course, requires the use of the indefinite conjugation when
used as an object of the verb:

    c. 1. <u>Azt</u> csinálok, amit akarok.[4]
       2. I do <u>whatever</u> I want.

    d. 1. <u>Azt</u> gondolok, ami nekem tetszik.
       2. I think <u>whatever</u> I please.

    e. 1. Szeretsz olvasni? <u>Azt</u> szeretek.
       2. Do you like to read? Yes, I do.

    f. 1. <u>Azt</u> nem igérek.
       2. I'm not promising <u>anything</u> of that sort.

Examples c.1 and d.1 contain a form of <u>az</u> used as a type of an-
ticipatory pronoun which is in direct contrast--as concerns defi-
niteness--with the anticipatory pronouns usually associated
with clause objects in Hungarian. Inasmuch as clause objects
merit a full discussion of their own, any further treatment of
this matter will be postponed until Chapter XII, where a more
complete treatment of these types of objects and their related
pronouns will be given.

7.3.3 <u>Demonstrative with restrictive modifiers</u>. The de-
monstrative in both English and Hungarian frequently occurs with
restrictive clauses, which indicates, from what we have discov-
ered previously, that they are often less than definite. We
have already seen in various sections of this work that <u>az</u>, for
example, is used in instances where its English equivalent is
a partial-anaphoric pronoun in that only some of the entities
included in the (previously-mentioned or situationally-understood)
referent are being dealt with subsequently. Other examples were
given in which the restricted demonstrative in Hungarian occurred
with rather indefinite reference. (See, for example, c.1 and d.1
of 7.3.2.2 immediately above.) These examples were given without

120

elaborating on the bilingual parallelism in patterns relating to these types of usage of these pronouns. It remains for us now to elaborate on such uses of the demonstratives in both languages in order to show once again the typical converging of the definite and indefinite categories with one and the same basic form used in partitive or independent constructions.

7.3.3.1 _Restrictive_ _demonstratives_ _as_ _partitives_. The demonstrative pronouns in the plural are especially capable of collocating with restrictive modifiers to indicate partiality of reference. We previously indicated this possibility with the following example in which the Hungarian construction closely parallels the English:

    a. 1. Those who were intelligent were interesting.
       2. Azok, akik intelligensek voltak, érdekesek voltak.

The partiality of reference in such instances may be clearly indicated by the use of the _of_-plus-noun-phrase pattern which identifies the total referent underlying the partitive pronoun:

    b. 1. Those _of_ _you_ who are tired may be seated.
       2. Közületek azok, akik fáradtak, leülhetnek.

While we had indicated above that deictic-anaphoric usage calls for _that_ _one_ in English, purely anaphoric partiality cannot be rendered at all, apparently, by the use of _that_, or even _that_ _one_. The Hungarian versatile form _az_, however, can occur in the latter type of usage also:

    c. 1. Az, aki fáradt, leülhet.
       2. The _one_ who is tired may be seated.
       3. *That (one) who is tired may be seated.

    d. 1. Adja azt, amely nekem legjobban megfelel.
       2. Give me _the_ _one_ which suits me the best.
       3. *Give me _that_ which suits me best. (i.e., the suit)

These forms, as we have seen in many places, pattern as indefinites when used in partial reference, even though there is an obvious relationship between such pronouns and a previously-mentioned noun phrase.

7.3.3.2 <u>Restrictive</u> <u>demonstratives</u> <u>as</u> <u>independent</u> <u>indefinites</u>. There is one area of usage of the restrictive demonstrative in English which may be labelled a "clear-cut" case of indefiniteness in that the pronominal form is used without a prior referent and with limiting modifier in a construction that is very closely parallel to those of forms which can occur only as indefinites. Such indefinites, which can, of course, occur independently as discourse initiators without prior referents, may often be substituted for the so-called demonstrative used in such a way, often without any change of meaning or emphasis whatever:

a. 1. There are those who feel that the war is unjust.
   2. Vannak olyanak, akik úgy éreznek, hogy a háború igazságtalan.

or
equally: b. 1. There are (some) people who feel that the war is unjust.
   2. Vannak (olyan) emberek, akik úgy éreznek, hogy a háború igazságtalan.

c. 1. That which was true then is true now.
   2. Az, ami igaz volt akkor, most is igaz.

or: d. 1. Whatever was true then is true now.
   2. Bármi volt igaz akkor, most is igaz.

As expected, uses of restrictive <u>that</u> with such indefinite reference as illustrated above merge structurally--and perhaps even semantically--with partial-anaphoric usage (actually in either language) as discussed above.

7.3.3.3 <u>Demonstratives</u> <u>as</u> <u>possessive</u>. In contrast to the
foregoing partially comparable uses of the demonstrative pronouns
in English and Hungarian, there is a use of the English modified
demonstrative which does not have a demonstrative counterpart in
Hungarian. This is the total-anaphoric use of the demonstrative
<u>that</u> in what amounts to possessive constructions marked by <u>of</u>-
phrases. While in other types of total-anaphoric usage one would
expect to find <u>it</u> employed as the replacement for a non-personal
noun phrase, in the pattern type in question, <u>that</u> is regularly
used instead of the unstressable <u>it</u> because of the emphatic na-
ture of the construction--usually some type of comparison. The
Hungarian equivalent usually has a pronominalizing possessive
marker to indicate the deletion of the identical noun phrase:

    a. 1. Ady's poetry is more abstract than <u>that</u> <u>of</u> Petőfi.
       2. Ady költészete elvontabb, mint Petőfi<u>é</u>.

    b. 1. The foreign trade of the Soviet Union is less
          extensive than <u>that</u> <u>of</u> the United States.
       2. A Szovjetunió külkereskedelme kisebb méretű,
          mint az Egyesült Államok<u>é</u>.

    c. 1. The façade of the Cathedral of Notre Dame is more
          ornate than <u>that</u> <u>of</u> the Rheims Cathedral.
       2. A Notre Dame katedrális homlokzata díszesebb,
          mint a rheimsi katedrális<u>é</u>.

It is quite apparent that in at least two of the instances given
above the English possessive construction with <u>'s</u> may be used as
an alternate for <u>that</u> <u>of</u>. In fact, there seems to be a scale of
probability--or acceptability--relating to the use of the inflec-
ted genitive in English as illustrated here, while, at the same
time, the Hungarian consistently uses the -<u>é</u> suffix. Consequent-
ly, we may profitably label the English <u>'s</u> construction "prefer-
able" in a.1 (<u>Petőfi's</u>), "possible" in b.1 (<u>the Soviet Union's</u>
or <u>the USSR's</u>, but perhaps not <u>the Union of Soviet Socialist</u>

Republics'), and "impossible" in c.1 (*the Rheims Cathedral's).
There are many more ramifications to the determination of the
status of definiteness of various types of possessive construc-
tions and the substitutes for them. However, suffice it to say
at this point that the particular types discussed here are "defi-
nite" in both English and Hungarian because of their total-ana-
phoric nature. It is quite evident that these anaphoric forms
represent all except the possessive of the previously-mentioned
(identical) noun phrases they replace in the second part of their
respective sentences. We shall defer until Chapter XI any ex-
tended discussion of possessive constructions in general.

7.3.4 Miscellaneous uses of the demonstrative forms. In
addition to the above cases of demonstrative use in English and
Hungarian, there are other fairly common occurrences in which
the pronoun in question functions in a way that is best described
as idiomatic. No attempt can be made here to analyze all pos-
sible constructions of this catch-all category. However, several
of them are worth mentioning for comparative purposes, if for
no other reason.

7.3.4.1 Demonstrative as derogatory personal pronoun. In
both languages being analyzed here the demonstrative--that is,
the low- (or back-) vowel variety, which seems to be the pre-
ferred form when there is point-of-view contrast intended--is
used with derogatory effect in the place of the usual definite
anaphoric personal pronoun. This usage cannot be called deictic
inasmuch as the individual being referred to need not be in
sight but only properly identified for both speaker and hearer:

a. 1. Did you really have a date with <u>that</u>?
   2. Igazán volt talalkád <u>azzal</u>?

The form <u>that</u> in a.1 above meets the same test for definiteness as the more usual pronoun <u>it</u> in that it refers to all of the pre-viously-mentioned noun phrase underlying it in prior discourse. We might say that <u>that</u> here is definitely definite, and the same holds for its Hungarian equivalent in a.2.

7.3.4.2 <u>Other occurrences of English demonstratives</u>. There are other combinations in English in which the form <u>that</u> occurs as a constituent. These are best left unanalyzed and need not concern us here greatly. It may be of interest, however, to show that these combinations may occur as various parts of speech, including "indefinite pronouns." The following examples may be noted together with a possible Hungarian equivalent: <u>all that</u> (everything of that sort) = <u>ilyesmi</u>, (to such a degree) = <u>annyira</u>, <u>for all that</u> = <u>mégis</u>, <u>at that</u> = <u>ráadásul</u>, and the like. Here again the status of definiteness of these forms is in doubt be-cause of the lack of a specifiable referent and the difficulty of applying any structural test to these forms in their set en-vironments.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1.   It goes without saying that practically any grammatical rule such as the one just formulated may be violated for various reasons, one of which is comic effect. For example, a cartoon caption in <u>Punch</u> capitalizes on the surprise effect achieved by the use of non-reflexive forms in the place of the expected re-flexives: "We have an ideal marriage--I love me and he loves him." (Reproduced in the "Telegraphic Section" of the <u>Painesville</u> (O.) <u>Telegraph</u>, Nov. 2, 1968, p.6.)

2.   It should be briefly noted here that whenever identifi-cation is requested with the use of a demonstrative pronoun in English, the answer may contain the form <u>it</u> instead of the demon-strative: "It's an apple tree." This is, of course, only one aspect of the total range of the anaphoric pronoun <u>it</u>.

3.   Examples a.1 and b.1 are taken from the <u>Értelmező Szótár</u> <u>I</u>, p. 368b.

4.   Examples c.1, d.1, and e.1 are taken from Bánhidi-Jókay (1960:408); f.1 and f.2 are from Hall (1944:77).

CHAPTER VIII

THE -IK PRONOUNS AND THEIR ENGLISH EQUIVALENTS

8.0 Introduction

The Hungarian pronouns in -ik are invariably included in the
traditional list of the object types which require the use of the
definite conjugation as given in grammars of Hungarian, e.g.
Tompa (1962:159). The definite status of these pronouns is some-
times explained diachronically, for example: "The ending -ik is
philologically identical with the -uk, -ük possessive suffix of
the 3rd. Person Plural ... The pronouns ending in -ik, since
this ending has been a possessive suffix, require the definite
conjugation." (Bánhidi et al. 1965:158). There are, however, at
least two synchronic considerations militating against accepting
this analysis as descriptively adequate, namely, 1) these pro-
nouns themselves may now occur with possessive suffixes in the
same fashion as nouns, and 2) being provided with possessive
suffixes is not in itself a sufficient condition for definite
status for a noun phrase, as will be shown in Chapter V. The
obvious syntactic characteristic of the -ik pronouns pertinent
for us here is their almost exclusive anaphoric nature. They
may be analyzed as definite on the basis of previous mention
(or, of course, situational identification) plus the feature of
totality. If these criteria are lacking, even an -ik pronoun
may be indefinite. Compare, for example, (egy) másik 'another'
with a másik 'the other (one).' Since the referents underlying
the -ik pronouns are clearly circumscribed in prior discourse,
the definiteness of such pronouns may even override the effect
of an otherwise indefinitizing prefix such as akár-:

        a. 1. Akármelyiket elfogadta volna. (Tompa 1962:159)
          2. He would have accepted any one of them.

which could be a natural response to a question such as:

        b. 1. Melyiket kivánja?[1]
          2. Which one does he want?

It ought to be mentioned here that, even without the reinforcing
pronoun one, the English equivalent which (with of them always
deleted) is considered by at least two other linguists to be a
definite form on the basis of the strongly anaphoric nature of
the pronoun.[2] There are cases, however, where the all-pervasive
definiteness of the Hungarian -ik pronouns is not indicated in
the most acceptable English equivalent. Consider the invariable
definiteness of egyik (as opposed to másik), for example, which
holds even in those negative sentences where logically all of the
definite set of entities referred to are excluded as a discourse
referent:

        c. 1. Egyiket sem kivánom. (also: semelyiket ...)
          2. I want none (of them). (Lit., 'Not even one do
                                I want.')

The most frequent employment of the -ik pronouns, however, does
occur with the definite article as the marker of their definite
nature, as in the following generic statement:

        d. 1. Az egyik baj eltemeti a másikat.
          2. One misfortune buries the other (next).

The overwhelmingly definite-anaphoric nature of the -ik pronomi-
nals is also indicated in the use of the definite articles with
ordinal numbers and also by the fact that this suffix may be ad-
ded optionally to adjectives in the comparative or superlative
(the latter--as in English--generally occurring with the definite
article in any case), if these forms are used anaphorically. We
shall examine these two patterns separately.

8.1 Ordinal pronominals

Both languages agree in the status of definiteness of ordinals used pronominally since, by convention, such pronominalizations generally occur only after previous mention (or, as usual, situational identification) allows the unambiguous deletion of the noun being delimited by the ordinal. After previous mention a discourse may be continued, for example, by a sentence as the following:

a. 1. A hatodik a legjobb.
2. The sixth one is the best.

The same theoretical and philosophic problems which we have encountered previously with regard to discourse referents and the like for any definite noun phrase also hold for the notion of "previous mention" relating to -ik nominals of the sort mentioned immediately above, since the identifying context does not necessarily have to precede the definitized noun phrase. The following example, for instance, illustrates a case where previous mention and situational identification merge inasmuch as the identifying situation is linguistically supplied:

b. 1. Én voltam a sorban az ötödik.
2. I was the fifth in line.

Ordinals are also used in stating dates in either language, but there is a contrast in form in that the Hungarian ordinal always appears marked with a possessive suffix, while the English equivalent may occur with the of-phrase deleted:

c. 1. Hatodikán utazott el.
2. He left on the sixth.

d. 1. f. hó hatodikán
2. on the sixth of this month

The possessive pattern is also employed in Hungarian when requesting the date, while the equivalent genitive phrase in English

is usually deleted:

> e. 1. Hányadika van ma?
>   2. What day is today? (or: What day of the month
>   is it today?)

8.2 Comparatives and superlatives in -ik

As mentioned above, anaphoric comparative and superlative
adjectives pattern with the definite article in Hungarian, and
both may occur optionally with the pronominalizing suffix -ik.
The English equivalents, on the other hand, generally require
the use of the pronominalizer one:

> a. 1. A kisebb(ik) is jó lesz.[3]
>   2. The smaller one will be all right too.
>
> b. 1. A nagyobb(ik)ra rá se nézett.
>   2. He didn't even look at the larger one.
>
> c. 1. A legszebb(ik)et választotta.
>   2. She chose the prettiest one.

This pattern may be compared to that in which the comparative is
employed as a predicate in an equational (i.e., identifying) sen-
tence. Here the article is optional in Hungarian with -ik ex-
cluded, while the English equivalent has either an unsupported
adjective form, or a pronominalized one with both the definite
article and one:

> d. 1. Azt gondolom, hogy ez (a) szebb.
>   2. I believe this is (the) prettier (one).

As a final remark it might be stated that in both languages the
notion of dual choice is strongly present in the use of the com-
parative, and this may be overtly indicated by the inclusion of
the exact dual referent underlying the pronominalized form:

> e. 1. A kettő közül melyik (a) különb?
>   2. Of the two which one is the better?
>   (or: ... which is the better one?)

130

There is no doubt, of course, that in both languages one can find that the strict number relationship traditionally associated with the comparative is not always adhered to. One does find the superlative employed in place of the expected comparative, but whichever is used, they both seem to behave the same in regard to their place in the definite category.

8.3 Possessive quantitative pronouns in Hungarian

The last type of Hungarian pronoun which we will discuss as being definite belongs to a mixed category, both morphologically and syntactically. These pronouns are, first of all, quantity pronominals appended with possessive suffixes, for example, kettejük 'the two of them' (cf. kettő 'two'), hármónk '(the) three of us' (cf. három 'three'), többünk 'several of us' (cf. több 'more/several'), etc. Now some of these forms are quite rare and all are of limited syntactic range. However, there is an interesting feature of at least one of these pronouns which is worth including in a discussion on the category of definiteness in Hungarian. This feature is their ambivalence, which manifests itself in two ways. First of all, some of these possessive numerical pronouns, according to one analysis (Bánhidi and Jókay 1960:406) display the same characteristics of definiteness, when used as objects, as all of the other "definite" noun phrase types discussed in this work. That is, as indefinite partitives they pattern with the indefinite conjugation; otherwise they are definite. Observe the following contrastive examples:

a. 1. Hármónkat kiválasztott. (also: hármunkat)
   2. He chose three of us.

b. 1. Kiválasztotta hármónkat.
   2. He chose the three of us.

Secondly, another series of pronouns of this type is exceptional in that it seems to vary in structural definiteness with a change in the person of the <u>subject</u> just as much as with a change in person of the <u>object</u>, as otherwise may be the case with object pronouns. The pronouns in question are plural possessives built on the base <u>mind</u> 'all' and occur only in non-subject functions: <u>mindnyájunkat</u> 'all of us (acc.),' <u>mindnyájatokat</u> 'all of you (pl. acc.),' and <u>mindnyájukat</u> 'all of them (acc.).'[4] While the third person form <u>mindnyájukat</u> patterns, as expected, with the definite conjugation, the other two pronouns u⁻ᵣer discussion pattern varyingly, depending on the person of the subject. If the subject is the first person, then the first person object pronoun patterns with the definite; if the subject is the second person, then the second person object pronoun takes the definite conjugation; if, however, the subject is in the third person, then either conjugation is possible:

c. 1. Látom mindnyájunkat.   I see all of us.
   2. Látjátok mindnyájatokat.   You see all of you(rselves).

but also: d. 1. Lát mindnyájunkat.   He sees all of us.
       2. Látja mindnyájunkat.   He sees all of us.

but also: e. 1. Hív mindnyájatokat.   He's calling all of you.
       2. Hívja mindnyájatokat.   He's calling all of you.

In those instances where the first or second person is the subject, c.1 and c.2 above, one may call the object pronouns a type of reflexive, which, as we have seen, is always considered a definite object in Hungarian. In the case of the third person subject, on the other hand, the variation in conjugational selection seems to be unmotivated since the Hungarian informant consulted could determine no difference in meaning between the two patterns as employed here.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

1. Example b.1 is adapted from, and c.1 is quoted from Bánhidi et al. (1965:150).

2. See, for example, Lees and Klima (1963) and the references given there.

3. The Hungarian examples used in this section are taken from the Értelmező szótár I:5.

4. The examples and the analysis here are from Tompa (1962: 159).

CHAPTER IX

INDEFINITE PRONOUNS

9.0 Introduction

"Indefinite" pronouns have been discussed quite extensively
but secondarily, in many of the sections of previous chapters.
Here will be brought together the most essential points of what,
for comparative purposes, has been previously said in regard to
the broad spectrum of indefiniteness as it applies to pronouns.
Then this chapter will conclude with a discussion of an important
category of pronominal (and structurally ambivalent) forms, name-
ly, the substantival interrogatives and the relative pronouns de-
rived from them.

9.1 Independent indefinite pronouns

There are indefinite pronouns in both English and Hungarian
which may be used without prior reference in the discourse, that
is, without any previously-mentioned or implied noun phrase re-
ferents underlying them, and which may therefore be called "in-
dependent indefinite pronouns."[1] These pronouns, in obvious
contrast to anaphoric pronouns, may be used to initiate a dis-
course, needing no particular referent to "replace" or "stand
for." As indicated previously, some of these pronouns are overt-
ly marked for indefiniteness by formative elements such as some-
and vala- in, for example, somebody, something, etc., valaki,
valami, etc., or by -ever, which has two possible equivalents,
akár- and bár-, as in whatever, whoever, etc., akármi and akárki
(or bármi and bárki), etc. In addition to these morphological
parallelisms, one finds that these pronouns consistently pattern

as indefinites in either language. The English pronouns, for
example, seem to be incompatible with non-restrictive clauses:

```
            a. 1. Everyone (whom) I know hates him.
but not:       2. *Everyone, whom I know, hates him.

            b. 1. Somebody (who was) wearing a mask robbed the bank.
but not:       2. *Somebody, who was wearing a mask, robbed the bank.
```

The equivalent pronouns in Hungarian are similarly indefinite and
collocate with the indefinite conjugation when used as objects:

```
            c. 1. Mindenkit üdvözlött.          (indef.)
               2. He greeted everyone.

            d. 1. Keresel valakit?              (indef.)
               2. Are you looking for someone?

            e. 1. Ök mindent tudnak.            (indef.)
               2. They know everything.
```

9.1.1 _Independent indefiniteness vs. totality._ We have
frequently encountered the phenomenon in both languages being
studied here that partiality of reference almost always over-
rides any other criterion for definiteness throughout the whole
syntactic category. We have concluded that _syntactic_ totality
must be a concurrent feature of a nominal in addition to other
criteria before full definiteness can be achieved. Now we can
observe that there is a corollary to this phenomenon, namely,
that _semantic_ totality as such is not a sufficient condition to
assure definitization, for, although such pronouns as _everyone/_
everybody, everything, Hungarian: _mindenki, minden_ are semanti-
cally all-inclusive, they nonetheless pattern syntactically like
any other indefinite pronoun. Here the complete lack of refer-
ent militates against definitization, that is to say, the totali-
ty involved here is not one of identity to any previously-men-
tioned or identified noun phrase. This fact can be used as a
criterion for separating the independent indefinites from the

partitive pronouns, both of which are generally lumped together under the traditional label "indefinite pronouns."

9.1.2 <u>Independent indefinites</u> vs. <u>partitives</u>. Although, as previously mentioned, there is very little intra-sentential structural difference between independent indefinite pronouns and partitives, there certainly is enough inter-sentential significance in this categorization to warrant a few remarks concerning it in a contrastive analysis such as the present work. In the first place, the independent indefinite vs. partitive distinction must be noted in English to account for the obvious fact that many sentences are "complete" in themselves as discourse initiators while others require previous mention or other identification for full comprehension. In Hungarian, on the other hand, this same distinction accounts for the fact that the indefinite conjugation may be used alone--that is, with the object deleted--to indicate partitiveness, while independent indefiniteness must be indicated by the use of an appropriate indefinite pronoun. Compare the use of the indefinite in a.1 with the use of a partitive in b.1:

    a. 1. Akarsz valamit?
        2. Do you want something?

    b. 1. Akarsz belőle?
        2. Do you want (some) of it?

The consequences of this particular dichotomy, however, are not as striking as the definite vs. partitive contrast, in which partiality moves otherwise definite noun phrases into the structurally indefinite category.

9.2 <u>Interrogative</u> and <u>relative</u> <u>pronouns</u>

Leaving aside all polemics concerning the best theoretical method of deriving the relative pronouns in English from

interrogative pronouns,[2] we consider it obvious that these two
pronoun types have some sort of relationship to each other--mor-
phological, if no other--and may be profitably discussed togeth-
er. The same can be said for the corresponding forms in Hungari-
an, the relative pronouns of which seem to be a composite of the
definite article a + the interrogative pronoun:

interrogative		relative	
ki?	who?	aki (amely)	who, that
mi?	what?	ami (amely)	which, what, that
melyik?	which (one)?	amelyik	which, that

Since we are primarily concerned here with the status of inter-
rogatives and relatives in the category of definiteness, which
is a feature of noun phrases, we will use the substantive forms
given above as the basis for our discussion. We will according-
ly exclude adverbial interrogatives of all sorts such as where?,
when?, how?, etc., and their Hungarian equivalents, as important
as they might be in a fuller discussion of pronominal forms.
For our purposes here these adverbial interrogatives, as well as
all possible adjectival or other non-substantival interrogative
forms have less direct connection with the category of definite-
ness.

9.2.1 Independent interrogatives. The three substantival
interrogatives listed above must in turn be divided into two
groups: "independent" (or "general") interrogatives, who? and
what? (ki? and mi?), and the "anaphoric interrogative" which?
(melyik?). The latter pronouns, as we have seen, may be classi-
fied as characteristically definite because of their deictic-
anaphoric nature. The other two interrogatives, who? (ki?) and
what? (mi?), on the other hand, may be categorized as indefinite

137

-128-

since they independently request the very type of information necessary for definitization. The definiteness of the English forms is otherwise difficult to test structurally because of their limited syntactic range. As interrogatives these forms can co-occur with, for example, relative clauses only in a very limited way, thereby separating themselves from independent indefinite pronouns on the one hand, and "personal pronouns" in more formal styles on the other. This is to say that while we may have, for example, something which ... and you, who ... or even, he who ..., we cannot readily have *what? which.... or *who? who ... However, some dialects accept who? that ... and what? that ..., which are acceptable to me only if discontinuous: "Who was there that we know?" or "What do you want that you don't have?" These clauses, of course, are restrictive. The equivalent interrogative pronouns in Hungarian, on the other hand, show the usual patterning with the indefinite conjugation when used as objects, in addition to their inability to collocate with relative clauses:

> a. 1. Mit látsz?
> 2. What do you see?
>
> b. 1. Kit látsz?
> 2. Who(m) do you see?

As we have seen, the indefiniteness of these pronouns in Hungarian is in direct contrast to the permanent definiteness of melyik?:

> c. 1. Melyiket látod?
> 2. Which (one) do you see?

since the latter form obviously refers to one entity out of a previously-mentioned group. The same holds true for the possessive form whose?, which may be pronominalized, that is, the noun associated with it may be deleted, after previous mention has

established the identity of its referent. The Hungarian equiva-
lent has a special pronominalizing possessive suffix which unam-
biguously marks the noun as definite. In fact, _which_ and _whose_
as pronouns may be interchangeable in some contexts since they
both refer to items singled out from a previously-mentioned group.
The Hungarian equivalents behave in the same manner. In both
cases it is apparent that we are dealing with definites, as can
be tested structurally: inability to pattern with relative
clauses in the case of the English forms, and government of the
definite conjugation in the case of the Hungarian. We may juxta-
pose these two definite pronouns in one sample sentence for each
language:

> d. 1. Which/Whose did you find? (i.e., _book_)
> 2. Melyiket/Kiét találtad meg?

9.2.2 _Interrogative-relative pronouns_. Intermediate be-
tween the two categories of usage, interrogative pronoun and re-
lative pronoun, is the syntactic category which may conveniently
be labelled "interrogative-relative." This is the occurrence of
the original interrogative in indirect speech, in which case the
pronoun retains its interrogative function while also serving to
introduce the object clause. This distinction has considerable
structural significance, including the fact that a change in word
order is involved in English, while the clause-introducing func-
tion of the equivalent in Hungarian may be taken over by the
subordinating conjunction _hogy_, the object clause otherwise re-
taining the original interrogative word order. In the following
examples the sentences marked 2. are to be taken as responses to
the respective questions preceding them:

. 139

	a. 1.	What is that?	Mi az?
	2.	I don't know what that is.	Nem tudom, (hogy) mi az.
	b. 1.	Who is that man (there)?	Ki az a férfi (ott)?
	2.	I don't know who that man is.	Nem tudom, (hogy) ki az a férfi.
but:	c. 1.	Who's sitting there now?	Ki ül most ott?
	2.	I don't know who's sitting there now.	Nem tudom, (hogy) ki ül most ott.
	d. 1.	Who did he see there?	Kit látott ott?
	2.	I don't know who he saw there.	Nem tudom, (hogy) kit látott ott.

Except for the difference in word order, e.g., in a.2 and b.2, as opposed to that in c.2 and d.2, the fundamental syntactic properties of the English interrogatives within these dependent clauses do not seem to be significantly different from their properties as pure indefinite interrogatives. We shall accordingly interpret the former pronouns as indefinite also, although, admittedly, other structural tests are impossible to make here. In the Hungarian equivalent of d.2, on the other hand, the verb in the object clause clearly marks the relative pronoun as indefinite. The contrasting us'. of the definite conjugation with the main verb in the same sentence, however, entails a discussion which will be postponed until Chapter XII, where the status of the whole (dependent) noun clause itself within the category of definiteness will be discussed at length.

9.2.3 <u>Relative pronouns</u>. Establishing the place of the English and Hungarian relative pronouns within the category of definiteness poses an interesting problem, both from the mono-lingual, as well as from the contrastive point of view. The pronouns we will be primarily dealing with here are <u>who</u> and its

objective form who(m), zero, and that/which, and their Hungarian equivalents. We shall start this phase of our discussion with a treatment of the pronouns of personal reference.

9.2.3.1 Personal reference with relative pronouns. In dealing with relative pronouns in English, we must proceed from the fact we have already established, namely, that they may introduce either restrictive or non-restrictive clauses. As we have already indicated, junctural phenomena keep these two clause types apart in speech, while commas are traditionally used to set off non-restrictive ("appositive") clauses in writing. In our examples here we will continue to follow this practice.

9.2.3.1.1 Relative pronouns in non-restrictive clauses. We have shown above that a non-restrictive clause modifying a noun phrase in English indicates that this noun phrase is definite and total, that is, it is already identified without the information given in the relative clause. It remains for us here to test whether the pronoun which joins a non-restrictive clause to such a noun phrase is also definite. We may begin here by reviewing two observations we have made in regard to definite noun phrases: 1) A singular definite noun phrase relating totally or identically to a non-collective antecedent is generally followed by a non-restrictive clause only (or, of course, by a repetitive restrictive one) and 2) A noun phrase which has a plural or collective referent in prior discourse is followed by a non-restrictive clause if the relative clause applies to all of the entities underlying the antecedent. These statements may be illustrated as follows:

```
        a. 1. I saw a man slip on the sidewalk this morning.
(all)      2. The man, who was around 60, was slightly hurt.

        b. 1. I saw a group of men enter the school.
(all)      2. The men, who were quite young, were foreign
              visitors.
```

Sentences a.2 and b.2 both reflect properly the totality of re-
ference, and with this fact in mind, we can assert that who in
the relative clause of sentence a.2 is a likely replacement for
a deleted noun phrase, the man: "The man (previously mentioned)--
the man was around 60--was slightly hurt." In a similar fashion
the clause "who were quite young" in b.2 represents a reduced
sentence, "The men were (all) quite young." Accordingly, we may
classify the relative pronouns in a.2 and b.2 as "total definite."
This is in contrast to the relatives in restrictive clauses,
which we have judged to be unacceptable to convey the idea of
totality of reference to a previously-identified antecedent. We
note, for example, that that does not seem to be an acceptable
replacement in standard English for who in a non-restrictive
clause as those above:

```
        c. 1. *The man, that was around 60, was slightly hurt.
           2. *The men, that were quite young, were foreign
                 visitors.
```

In a subtotal sense, of course, the latter sentences would be
acceptable if the clauses they contain were changed into restric-
tive ones. These cases will be discussed separately.

9.2.3.1.2 Relatives in restrictive clauses. If we modify
sentence a.1 above, we can provide a suitable discourse in which
a following restrictive clause is perfectly acceptable, and, if
we are not referring to the whole group of men mentioned in b.1,
then b.2 below is similarly acceptable:

a. 1. I saw two men slip on the sidewalk.
   2. The man who/that was around 60 was slightly hurt.

b. 1. I saw a group of men enter the school.
   2. The men who/that were quite young were foreign visitors.

We note that that is substitutable here for who in the restrictive clauses, and if we now examine the status of the relative pronouns in these two sentences with partitive meaning, we can see that the underlying forms are partitives, but are still definite: "One man (of a previously-mentioned group)--the man was around 60--was hurt." = "The man who was around 60 was slightly hurt." The underlying forms of the two sentences combined to form b.2 may be given as follows: "Some men (of a previously-mentioned group)--these men were quite young--were foreign visitors," which reduces to: "The men who were quite young were foreign visitors." Although the man of a.2 and the men of b.2 may be labelled "partial definite" because of the concurrent occurrence of the definite article and the restrictive relative clause with the nouns, it would be difficult to go beyond the dichotomy of definite vs. indefinite in the case of the relative pronouns, inasmuch as further structural tests fail to make a finer distinction. The relative pronouns here--as partitives-- might be simply labelled "partial-definite" by analogy to the noun phrases which underlie them. However, when we go beyond the mere relative pronoun and consider the entire noun phrase of a complex sentence such as a.2 and b.2 above, that is, when determiner plus noun plus the relative clause are considered together, much more can be said with regard to degrees of definiteness. The following section will treat of this matter, and we will attempt to draw conclusions from these patterns which will

be valid for the whole category of definiteness in both languages.

9.2.3.1.3 <u>Hungarian</u> <u>personal</u> <u>relatives</u> <u>vs.</u> <u>determiner</u> <u>pat-</u>
<u>terns.</u> In order to discuss Hungarian relative pronouns in the
most meaningful way, one must recall what has been already men-
tioned in regard to these pronouns and the types of clause they
can occur in, namely that Hungarian grammar does not make a clear
distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive clauses.
Neither juncture nor orthography consistently distinguishes the
two clause types. Accordingly, the task of distinguishing the
status of definiteness of a noun phrase in Hungarian rests not
with the relative clause or its introductory pronoun, but prima-
rily with the various determiners of the given noun phrases.
This was already shown, for example, in the discussion of total
vs. partial reference where two different definite determiners
in Hungarian carried the contrast while the relative clauses re-
mained the same:

a. 1. A férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, ...
 2. The men, who were intelligent, ...

vs.   b. 1. Azok a férfiak, akik intelligensek voltak, ...
    2. The men who were intelligent ...

Since the relative clause patterns do not contrast here, one can
assume that the status of definiteness of the relative pronouns
would be the same also. This proves to be the case. However,
while the Hungarian subject noun phrases in a.1 and b.1 are con-
sidered definite, the relative pronouns pattern as indefinites--
as do almost all relative pronouns in Hungarian, regardless of
the status of the nouns they relate to. Let us now focus our
attention on this aspect of the grammar of Hungarian.

9.2.3.1.4 <u>Status of definiteness of Hungarian relative</u>
<u>pronouns</u>. Although for the purpose of easier explication, from
the point of view of English grammar, we are purposely discussing
only relative pronouns of "personal reference" at this point in
our study, there is in a stricter sense little motivation for
separating personal from non-personal relative pronoun types in
Hungarian since there is a great deal of overlapping to be ob-
served. Furthermore, what is said in regard to the definiteness
of one of these types of relative pronouns holds for the other
also. Variation in definiteness of Hungarian relative pronouns
occurs only in the area of "overlap," that is, with the employ-
ment of the definite form <u>melyik</u>, which may have either a person-
al or non-personal referent. The generally-used relative pro-
noun of personal reference, <u>aki</u>, on the other hand, not only
shows a uniformity of form and patterning, regardless of the
definite status of the noun phrase it relates to, but also gov-
erns the use of the indefinite conjugation when used as an ob-
ject in its clause, again regardless of the status of its ante-
cedent. Several sample sentences showing this characteristic
should suffice for the present:

a. 1. A tanár, akit mindenki kedvel, rövidesen
       nyugdíjba megy.
   2. The teacher, whom everyone likes, is to retire
       soon.

b. 1. Az a tanár, akit mindenki kedvel, rövidesen
       nyugdíjba megy.
   2. The teacher whom everyone likes is going to
       retire soon.

c. 1. Egy tanár, akit mindenki kedvel, rövidesen
       nyugdíjba megy.
   2. A teacher whom everyone likes is going to retire
       soon.

d. 1. Egy olyan tanár, akit mindenki kedvel, egy igazi
       kincs.
   2. A teacher whom everyone likes is a real treasure.

The indefiniteness of <u>aki</u> may be accounted for by the fact that there is such a close synchronic connection between this relative pronoun and the indefinite interrogative pronoun <u>ki</u> that it is difficult to draw a precise boundary between them. In the first place, the relative pronoun of personal reference (along with the other relatives) may occur without the prefix <u>a</u>- in some styles of speech and writing:

e. 1. János, (a)kit mindenki kedvel, adta ide nekem.
   2. John, who(m) everyone likes, gave it to me.

In the second place, <u>aki</u> may be used as an independent "relative" pronoun without any particular noun phrase to which it can be related, in which case the modern English equivalent generally has the indefinite suffix -<u>ever</u>, or is composed of some other combination of pronoun plus indefinite marker:

f. 1. <u>Akit</u> szeretett, elhagyta, <u>akit</u> gyűlölt, jót
      tett vele.[3]
   2. <u>Who(m)</u>(<u>ever</u>) he loved, he left; <u>who(m)</u>(<u>ever</u>) he
      hated, he was good to.

g. 1. Van, <u>aki</u> szereti a sárgarépát.
   2. There are <u>those</u> <u>who</u> like carrots.
      (lit.: "is <u>someone</u> <u>who</u>")

h. 1. <u>Akik</u> elmúltak 10 évesek, álljanak ide.
   2. <u>Those</u> who are over 10 years old should line up
      here.

i. 1. Nincs, aki megmondja neki az igazat.
   2. There is <u>no</u> <u>one</u> <u>who</u> dares tell him the truth.

In proverbs and other older styles of English <u>who</u> may also occur as an independent relative, giving a pattern closely parallel to the Hungarian, e.g., "<u>Who</u> steals my purse steals trash ..." In any case, the status of indefiniteness of the underlined forms is, I believe, quite apparent in all of the examples. It might be noted that in addition to the marked indefiniteness of <u>akit</u> in f.1, the examples given in h.1 and i.1 show another common

pattern in which indefinites often occur. This is the pattern in which van "there is" (or its negative nincs) is used to state (or deny) the existence of an entity as yet unspecified. In addition to the fact that aki is indefinite within its own clause, the relative clause itself thereby seems to be indefinite here. This is in contrast to the usual definiteness of noun clauses-- in either language--especially those derived from direct questions, which are most often treated as definites, as we shall see in Chapter XII.

9.2.3.1.5 _The definite relative amelyik_. The relative pronoun amelyik deserves special treatment here for several reasons. First of all, it is the only relative pronoun in Hungarian which as a direct object patterns with the definite conjugation. In the second place, it can occur with either personal or non-personal reference. Finally, it shows a consistency in usage not matched in any one counterpart in English. Now we have previously seen that the interrogative counterpart of amelyik, melyik, and its English equivalent which are the only interrogative pronouns in the languages being studied here which are considered to be as definite as the possessive pronouns kié and whose. These interrogatives show, accordingly, many close structural parallelisms. The relative pronouns amelyik and which, on the other hand, show many fewer structural correspondances, mainly because of the divergent patterns of the English forms, which need to be displayed in a contrastive work such as this. While the interrogative melyik and its English counterpart which request a selection from a previously-identified group of entities, only the relative amelyik consistently continues to have

this function, with either personal or non-personal reference.
The relative <u>which</u>, on the other hand, is used primarily in re-
ference to non-personal antecedents, either definite concrete
objects--not necessarily from a previously-mentioned group--or
ideas contained in statements of various kinds just given by the
speaker. Several examples will be given in which <u>amelyik</u> per-
forms its usual function, here with personal reference. From
the English translations it can be seen that <u>which</u> is rarely em-
ployed with personal reference:

> a. 1. Hívd meg, <u>amelyiket</u> akarod.
>   2. Invite <u>the one</u> you want. (or <u>whichever one</u> you
>   prefer)
> b. 1. Három fia volt, s azt szerette legjobban,
>   <u>amelyik</u> leginkább hasonlított hozzá. (also <u>aki</u>)
>   2. He had three sons, and he loved best of all
>   <u>the one who/that</u> resembled him the most.

The cases where unsupported <u>which</u> does have a personal reference
seem to be those in which the pronoun is in an indirect question
and appears only as an interrogative-relative or non-relative
pronoun. For example:

> c. 1. He has two songs, Joe and Pete, but I don't know
>   <u>which</u> is <u>which</u>.
>   2. Két fia van, Jóska és Pista, de én nem tudom
>   <u>melyikük melyik</u>. '<u>which of them</u>'

Here it can be assumed that <u>which</u> is definite for the same rea-
sons we gave for the definiteness of the corresponding direct
use of the interrogative. <u>Amelyik</u>, on the other hand, always
requires the use of the definite conjugation and is best rendered
into English as <u>the one who/that</u> to convey the idea of definite-
ness. The use of <u>that</u>, incidentally, for personal as well as
non-personal reference shows a close parallelism with the pronoun
<u>amelyik</u> in at least one regard, but, of course, this fact has
little bearing on the definite status of the English forms.

Another well-known sidelight to the issue of overlapping reference of person is the fact that the relative pronouns in English may be deleted when they occur as the objects in their clauses. Relative pronoun deletion in Hungarian does not seem to occur at any level of usage, regardless of reference, definiteness, or function within the clause.

9.2.3.2 <u>Concrete non-personal reference with relative pronouns</u>. It was indicated above that the range of reference of <u>amelyik</u> extends over both personal and non-personal antecedents in Hungarian, while <u>that</u> serves a similar function in English. In addition to these two pronouns, the languages being studied here each have a relative pronoun generally used in non-personal reference, namely <u>amely</u> and <u>which</u>. From the examples below it can be seen that, unlike <u>amelyik</u>, the pronoun <u>amely</u> as object patterns with the indefinite conjugation, regardless of the status of definiteness of its antecedent:[4]

a. 1. Ez az a ló, <u>amelyet</u> apám vett.
   2. This is the horse <u>(which/that)</u> my father bought.

b. 1. Vettem egy könyvet, <u>melyet</u> jutalmul a fiamnak adok.
   2. I bought a book <u>which</u> I'm going to give to my son as a prize. (or <u>that</u>)

c. 1. Az olyan sereg, <u>amelyet</u> vezére elhagy, felbomlik.
   2. An army <u>which/that</u> its commander abandons disintegrates. (or <u>which</u> is abandoned by its commander)

In regard to the choice of the non-personal relative pronouns in the English sentences above, the native informants questioned were evenly divided in their preference for <u>that</u> in the place of <u>which</u>. As for the status of definiteness of these forms, there seems to be little motivation for considering either one more

definite than the other in such sentences as those above where the pronouns are interchangeable. Once the definite status of one alternate has been ascertained, the status of the other should be considered the same. I would classify the relative pronouns in these three English sentences primarily on the basis of the underlying form of the sentence from which the relative clause had been derived. Thus, the relative pronouns in b.2 and c.2, for example, differ from each other since it is apparent that in b.2 a _definite_ noun phrase, _the_ _book_ (as previously mentioned or identified in the first part of the complex sentence) or _it_, underlies the relative pronoun, while an introductory _indefinite_, _an_ _army_, underlies the relative in c.2. In the first instance, the object is identified, after which additional information is given in regard to the now-identified object. In c.2, on the other hand, the relative clause _is_ the identifying context necessary for definitization so that, while the subject of the main clause may be considered generic and therefore definite in some sense or other, the relative pronoun in such sentences lacks--for the moment--the conditions necessary for definitization and should therefore be considered indefinite. It is possible, of course, that an English sentence such as a.2 above is a direct answer to a question referring to a choice from among a definite group, in which case, the relative pronoun could be considered definite through previous identification, for example:

d. 1. _Which_ _horse_ did your father buy?
2. This is _the_ _horse_ _which_ my father bought.

Again, however, if a.2 were considered as containing the introductory sentence itself embedded within it, then the relative pronoun might be considered indefinite.

9.3 Summary of the status of pronouns in the category of definiteness

After such a long survey of the general usage of pronouns in English and Hungarian and their status within the category of definiteness, it may prove useful to summarize the main points brought out in the various discussions. It was shown that the rules for definitization of noun phrases in their basic forms also apply to the definitization of pronouns as well. Previous mention was seen to be the principal basis for considering an entity definite, provided, of course, the reference to the previously-mentioned noun is total. Therefore a pronoun such as he is as definite as the man in subsequent discourse after a suitable referent has been established. There are, in addition to the "total-definite" pronouns, which result from the above-mentioned situation, forms which may be labelled "partial-definite" since they refer to only part of the entities included in a previously-mentioned group. Lastly, one can recognize at least two levels of "indefiniteness" in pronouns also. One level, "independent indefinite," is represented by such forms as someone, something, who?, what?, etc., which require no previous mention for its employment. The other type of "indefinite" is more properly called "partitive" or "partial-anaphoric," possible only after some referent has been established in prior discourse. The notion of previous mention (or situational identification, of course), in conjunction with the feature of totality, remains the keystone of definiteness in both languages, not only in the case of the pronouns, but also in the case of virtually all noun phrase types, such as possessives, proper nouns, and noun clauses, all of which will be discussed in subsequent chapters.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IX

1. In transformational-generative terms one would (at present) say that the pronouns under discussion here are "generated in the base" rather than "derived transformationally."

2. See, for example, Koutsoudas (1968a) and the references given there.

3. The following four Hungarian sentences are taken from the Értelmező Szótár I, p. 84.

4. Sentences a.1 and c.1 are from the Értelmező Szótár I, p. 196, b.1 from Tompa (1962:330).

5. Or, in transformational terms, an "intermediate" (i.e. "non-existent") nominalization of the verb phrase (VP) in the preceding part of the sentence. This analysis has much that is useful in it and will, accordingly, be given as an alternate suggestion below.

6. It may be of interest to note that Webster's Third New International Dictionary (p. 2603c) indicates that some grammarians object to the use of which in such cases, while its Hungarian counterpart, ami, is labelled (irod. sajtó) 'literary' and 'journalistic' in the Értelmező Szótár I (p. 199b). The non-literary example given for the latter form was accompanied by a suggested correct form.

CHAPTER X

PROPER NOUNS

10.0 Introduction

In the Introduction to this study we cited passages from
four different sources in which it was stated that proper nouns
are to be classified as definite. The authors of these state-
ments, one of which pertains to Hungarian and three to English,
give no further elaboration nor attempt to qualify or modify
their statements in any way, thus leaving a great deal of data
pertaining to proper nouns unaccounted for. It is an open ques-
tion whether one can speak of proper nouns as being definite per
se, or whether one must look for various criteria being met be-
fore any classification can be made in regard to the definiteness
of various occurrences of such nouns. This chapter, then, will
test the notion of definiteness of proper nouns by examining all
types of occurrences of such forms as they are traditionally
thought of. It is hoped that definitive statements can be for-
mulated in regard to the status of proper nouns in the category
of definiteness.

As a working definition we shall use the definition of
proper noun (or "proper name") given in Webster's Third New In-
ternational Dictionary: "A noun that designates a particular
being or thing, does not take a limiting modifier, and is usu.
capitalized in English." (page 1818a). An improvement on this
definition will be suggested at the end of this chapter.

10.1 Determiners with "proper nouns"

In Chapter I of this study we discussed the use of the

definite article to mark a common noun in both English and Hungarian that has been definitized through previous mention or is considered definite through mutual knowledge or assumed identification by speaker and hearer in the situation in which discourse is taking place. In the light of the above definition of proper nouns, on the other hand, use of the definite article, or any other overt article, for that matter, would presumably have the effect of reducing the proper noun to common, if one assumes the definition quoted above is correct. In the event a proper noun were reduced to a common, one could further presume that definitization would not be automatic, but would have to proceed in the same manner as in the case of "ordinary" common nouns. To test these presumptions, one would have to answer three basic questions: 1) Do "proper nouns" as such actually occur with determiners (other than zero)? 2) Are "proper nouns" always definite? and 3) If not, under what conditions are such nouns less than definite? Question 1 can be answered almost immediately upon examination of just a minimal amount of data; questions and 3 will bear more discussion, but can be answered simultaneously since they are inextricably related. Our answers to the latter questions will contain generalizations valid for all types of noun phrases which may be definitized in either English or Hungarian.

10.1.1 The determiner as part of the name. The qualification for proper noun status as quoted from Webster's Third New International Dictionary that such a noun "does not take a limiting modifier" leaves open the question whether to consider the determiner in such names, for example, as the Hague, the Argentine,

the Ukraine, the Mississippi, the United States, the Rocky Mountains, etc., as a "limiting modifier." Are these forms less qualified as members of the proper noun class than, for example, Paris, Argentina, Ukrania, and the like? The answer to this question is obvious. Some proper nouns simply contain an article--the definite article, to be more exact--as an integral part of the name. This is true for Hungarian also. Without attempting to give an exhaustive list of such proper nouns for each language being discussed here,[1] I shall present a brief listing in the belief that a short comparative list of representative types may be of general interest, and that even a brief list would suffice to illustrate the tendency under discussion. For contrastive purposes, examples will also be given in which differences in article usage occur:

Type of Entity		English	Hungarian
Heavenly bodies		the North Star (the polestar)	a Sarkcsillag
		the Earth (earth)	a Föld (föld)
		the Great Bear	a Nagymedve
	also:	the Big Dipper	
	but:	Ursa Major	
		Mars, Venus, etc.	a Mars, a Vénus, etc.
Topographical names		the Atlantic (Ocean)	az Atlanti-óceán
		the Danube (River)	a Duna
		the Great Lakes	a Nagy Tavak
	but:	Lake Balaton	a Balaton
		the Alps	az Alpok
		the Caucasus (Caucasia)	a Kaukázus
	but:	Gellert Hill	a Gellért Hegy
Geo-political divisions		the Argentine (Argentina)	Argentina
	but:	the Ukraine (Ukrania)	Ukrajna
		the United States	az Egyesült Allamok
		the Soviet Union	a Szovjetunió

Type of Entity	English	Hungarian
	the Union of South Africa	a Dél-afrika Unió
but:	the Hague	Hága
	the Hungarian Peoples Republic	A Magyar Nép-köztársaság
Cultural and/or commercial entities	the Academy	az Akadémia
	The Gellert (Hotel)	a Gellért
	the New York Stock Exchange	a new yorki értéktőzsde
	the Third Symphony	a III. szimfónia
	the Tragedy of Man	az ember tra-gédiája
	the Evening News	az Esti Hírlap
but:	Credit	Hitel (book title)
	Kossuth Cigarettes (Kossuths)	a Kossuth (cigareta)

This list could be extended almost at will, both in regard to illustrations of correspondences in occurrence of the article, and in contrasts. This would be especially true, of course, if one were to list a greater number of local or culturally-bound entities found in either language. In English, for example, names such as the Toe, the Body, nicknames for a football player and movie star respectively, abound at all levels of usage. Upon surveying the above short list, however, one can make several observations with regard to the more usual type of proper noun in both English and Hungarian. First of all, some categories of names, such as those of mountain ranges, rivers, oceans, etc., regularly occur with the article as part of the name, while other names, personal names in particular, lack the determiner. Secondly, if the name contains a qualifier as a constituent, then the definite article is almost invariably employed, for example, the United States (also United States), az Egyesült Államok. Thirdly, the article, or lack of it, may have a contrastive function, inasmuch as names of two separate entities may differ

only in this respect, although in seemingly all cases a fuller name stands at the speaker's disposal which may be additionally employed to avoid ambiguity whenever necessary. Generally speaking, one of the contrasting names may be that of a person, while the other may be that of another entity named after the given person. However, this need not always be the case, as the second example here shows: <u>Queen Elizabeth</u> (<u>the Second</u>) <u>vs</u>. <u>the Queen Elizabeth</u> (ship), <u>Missouri</u> (state) vs. <u>the Missouri</u> (<u>River</u>), <u>Conrad Hilton</u> vs. <u>the Conrad Hilton</u> (<u>Hotel</u>), and so forth. A Hungarian example was given in the comparative list above: <u>Kossuth</u> (statesman) vs. <u>a Kossuth</u> (<u>cigareta</u>). Finally, although it certainly is more than coincidence that the <u>definite</u> article is the one usually selected to form a constituent of a proper name, the very presence or absence of the definite article with isolated occurrences of proper names says nothing in regard to the definiteness of the noun in question. To repeat an observation made considerably earlier in this work, definiteness is a <u>syntactic</u> category. It applies to noun phrases, common or otherwise, within the context of a discourse. Structurally speaking, a "proper noun" such as <u>Mary</u> is no more definite in isolation than a "common noun" such as <u>mother</u>. What is more, there are discourse situations in which both types of nouns may pattern identically, giving us justification for affording them the same status in the category of definiteness. We shall now examine "proper nouns," as defined above, to determine what variations in patterning occur in various types of contexts.

10.1.2 <u>Syntactically-determined use of determiners with proper nouns</u>. In addition to the fact that many proper nouns,

both in English and Hungarian, occur with the definite article as part of the name, it can be readily observed that there are contextually- (or syntactically-) determined uses of the article with proper nouns which ordinarily appear without an article in citation form. As indicated above, qualifying a proper noun generally entails the use of the definite article before the qualifier.[2] Since usage varies within one language in this respect, the possibilities for contrasting structures to occur when there are two languages involved are quite great. Therefore, we feel that these pattern types will require some sort of categorization for easier explication here. We shall start with the patterns occurring when a proper personal name is qualified.

10.1.2.1 _Personal names qualified._ As a rule, unqualified personal names do not occur with a definite determiner in English. In Hungarian, on the other hand, the definite article may-- after certain conditions have been met--optionally occur with such names, even given names: (a) János 'John,' (a) Kovács Pista 'Steve Smith' and the like. This phenomenon will be discussed further below. What concerns us more immediately here is the fact that in those cases where qualifiers are used with proper nouns, the situation in respect to article usage changes somewhat. In Hungarian the definite article is now obligatory, while in English the use of the article is optional in some instances. It appears that if the qualifying attribute expresses a permanent quality of the individual in question, then no article is employed in English. Stress variation, in fact, indicates that the qualifier is often felt to be an integral part of the name: a kis Zsuzsi 'little (Little) Susie,' a hallgatag Kovács Pista

'silent (Silent) Steve Smith.' If, on the other hand, the quali-
fication indicates a temporary state, English may employ the ar-
ticle also: (the) vacationing Johnny Carson, (the) injured Bob
Smith, the Young Stalin (title of a book by Edward Ellis Smith),
etc. There exists even the possibility of employing the indefi-
nite article before such a qualifier indicating a temporary state:

<div>
a. 1. A serene and happy Mary accepted the invitation.
also: 2. Serene and happy, Mary accepted the invitation.
and   3. Mary, serene and happy, accepted the invitation.
</div>

The examples above illustrate what may be called a reflexive com-
parison, that is, a comparison of one phase of an individual's
total development with another phase. It is, I believe, reason-
able to label the nouns so qualified as proper nouns, although,
of course, their status as definites is open to discussion. A
similar type of qualification of such a proper name may not in-
dicate two chronologically viewed aspects of an individual's life
but rather a subjective view of the character of the individual
in question. Several examples from popular literature in English
are:

<div>
b. 1. The Other Dean Rusk (magazine article by Milton
                Vrorst)
  2. There are two Richard Nixons (article by Art
                             Buchwald)
</div>

Perhaps more often that not, the qualifier takes the form of a
relative clause which, of course, follows the noun in English,
the relative pronoun being optionally deleted when it occurs as
an object in its clause. As will be indicated in sentences g.2,
g.3, h.3, and h.4 in section 10.1.2.2 below, the Hungarian equi-
valent modifying structures may either precede or follow their
head nouns. The following book titles--with suggested Hungarian
equivalents--may serve to illustrate this tendency:

c. 1. The Roosevelt I have known (by Frances Perkins)
   2. A Roosevelt, akit én ismertem.

d. 1. The Bobby Kennedy Nobody Knows (by William Nicholas)
   2. A Kennedy Róbert, akit senki sem ismer.

After examining even the few examples given above, one must conclude that Fillmore's remark regarding the incompatibility of restrictive relative clauses with proper names must be amended in some way to account for the patterns illustrated in c.1 and d.1. In addition, all of the examples given above contain a proper noun which is preceded by a "limiting modifier." The presence of a limiting modifier therefore does not seem to be a sufficient condition for treating the given modified noun as common rather than proper. Since in actuality the very same in-dividual is the referent for the name in each case, we cannot do more than label the noun in question a proper noun, the re-ferent of which is considered from two points of view. As for the definiteness of such a proper noun, see 10.1.3 below. There are other cases of modified "proper nouns" in which the nouns involved are no longer to be considered legitimate proper nouns. These will be discussed after the following brief discussion of modified place names.

10.1.2.2 Place names qualified. From the Hungarian point of view it would not have been particularly necessary to make a separate category for modified place names, since these pattern, for the most part, just like modified personal names. From the point of view of English, however, several variations in pattern-ing are to be observed with place names which do not generally occur with personal names. In the first place, although only modified personal names occur with an article as a rule, there

are numbers of place names in English--whether qualified or not--
which do occur with a definite article. Those place names in
English which do not regularly occur with the article when un-
qualified, moreover, still show variations in patterning when
they are modified, depending on the type of modification. Note
the difference in article usage when two different types of pre-
positional phrase modifiers are used, for example:

> a. 1. Paris in the 19th century ...
>   2. The Paris of the 19th century ...

These examples have Hungarian equivalents which correspond fair-
ly closely to the structural patterns of the English construc-
tions, the adjectival modifier, however, most frequently occur-
ring preposed:

> b. 1. Párizs a 19. században ...
>   2. A 19. századi Párizs ...

In fact, in almost all cases of modified place names, qualifiers
are preposed in Hungarian with the definite article employed,
while the English equivalents show varying patterns:

> c. 1. az új Magyarország
>   2. new Hungary (the new Hungary)
>
> d. 1. a mai Magyarország
>   2. the Hungary of today (?today's Hungary)
>
> e. 1. a szabad Kína
>   2. free China

Restrictive modifiers such as those above usually have full stress
in either language, the whole pattern resembling an extended
proper name. There seems to be no reason here for not construing
the noun phrases here as proper nouns and as definite. However,
it may be mentioned at this point in our discussion that "indefi-
nite proper nouns" are also possible, as, for example, when a
hypothetical referent is mentioned. An optional indefinite

161

article occurs in the English construction of this type, while
the zero determiner is preferred in Hungarian in some of these
"reflexive comparison" patterns:

> f. 1. (A) Paris without the Eiffel Tower would seem
>   incomplete.
>   2. Párizs az Eiffel-torony nélkül befejezetlennek
>   látszana.

When the entity in question is considered in relation, not to
itself, but to another entity, the indefinite article is pos-
sible in Hungarian also. Since the noun phrase involved under-
goes a change in meaning, it can no longer be called a proper
noun. Such nouns will be discussed in 10.2 below. Generally
speaking, however, qualified place names in either language re-
quire the use of the definite article. The following basic ex-
ample is illustrative of this tendency, and will form the core
of a discussion in the next section:

> g. 1. The Paris that we love[4] (title of a book by Mau-
>   rois, Cousteau et al.)
>   2. A Párizs, amelyet szeretünk
> or: 3. A mi szeretett Párizsunk (lit.: Our beloved
>   Paris)

It may be incidentally remarked here that a place name which al-
ready has an article as a constituent in English seems to appear
with only one article. Those in Hungarian which have an article
take the demonstrative under similar conditions, since there is
an implied contrast present, the demonstrative being the pre-
ferred determiner before a noun occurring with a restrictive
modifier:

> h. 1. the Hague that I love ...
>   2. ?the the Hague that I love ... (?the The Hague ...)
>   3. a Hága, amelyet szeretek ...
> or: 4. az én szeretett Hágám ...

> i. 1. This isn't the United States that I used to know.
>   2. Ez nem az az Egyesült Allamok, amelyet én
>   (valaha) ismertem.   162

-153-

Both the Hungarian and the English noun phrases here seem to pattern like common nouns in their use of determiners and restrictive modifiers. How this fact affects their status as definites will now be discussed.

10.1.3 <u>The status of definiteness of qualified proper nouns.</u> In considering the definiteness of proper nouns which are qualified as indicated above, one must return to the first part of the "working definition" of proper noun which was quoted above: "A noun that designates a particular being or thing ... " Upon examining the examples of modified proper nouns given in 10.1.2.2 above, it is reasonable to assert that, if the identity of "the particular being or thing" designated by a proper noun has been established in prior discourse, or is situationally (i.e., culturally) identifiable, then one must consider such a proper noun to be definite in the same way as a common noun. In all of the examples above--except f.1 and f.2, which will be discussed in 10.2--the same "particular being or thing" is being referred to, in the final analysis, as would be the case if the noun in question were not modified. The modification, of course, does seem to remove the proper noun from the total-definite category, but it seems that a proper name modified as above is just as definite as a common noun, for example, which is introduced together with its identifying clause, making the noun in question eligible for immediate definitization. Thus, the underlined (common) noun phrase in a.1 is just as definite as that in a.2, and in a similar fashion the underlined (proper) noun phrase in b.1 is just as definite as those in b.2:

a. 1. <u>The</u> <u>story</u> I am about to tell is true.
2. I am about to tell a story. <u>The</u> <u>story</u> I am about to tell is true.[5]

b. 1. <u>The</u> <u>Paris</u> that we love ...
2. We love (a city named) <u>Paris</u>. <u>The</u> <u>Paris</u> that we love ...

In other words, once the identity of the real-world referent for the noun <u>Paris</u> is known in the discourse situation, the noun in question (here with zero determiner) is to be considered definite when being subsequently referred to, even though it lacks an unambiguous marker of definiteness. In sentences b.1 and b.2 above the same legitimate discourse referent is meant. Accordingly, each occurrence of the noun is to be considered a proper noun, and ought to be considered definite, even though this would seemingly violate the rule that proper nouns do not co-occur with restrictive clauses. However, this "violation"[6] poses no problem at all, since we have already seen that other definite noun phrases, those which are used as partitives, do collocate with restrictive clauses. In fact, there seems to be no reason for not considering any proper noun qualified as above as "partial-definite" inasmuch as there always seems to be a dichotomy, either expressed overtly or implicit, in such qualification. Note, for example, <u>the</u> <u>other</u> <u>Dean</u> <u>Rusk</u>. In the case of any noun phrase with restrictive modification, there seems to be a partial vs. total contrast implied: "The X, as modified, opposed to all other X." A previous sentence can furnish us with a good example here: "The story I am about to tell" as opposed to "all other possible stories." This total-vs.-partial dichotomy is the key to our analysis of proper nouns and--as mentioned repeatedly--of all noun phrases which can be made definite, and will be an essential ingredient of our reworked

definition of proper noun as given in 10.4 below. To arrive at
our new definition of the category "proper noun," we need to
discuss another use of so-called proper names which appear to be
proper nouns at first glance, but which upon closer inspection
are found to be no more than common nouns which have rather re-
stricted semantic domains.

10.2 "Proper names" as common nouns

When nouns such as <u>John</u>, <u>Mary Jones</u>, or <u>Paris</u>, traditionally
called "proper nouns" or "proper names," are used with no "par-
ticular being or thing" being referred to as such, then we have
a semantic and syntactic situation in which it is no longer valid
to label such nouns "proper nouns." They may be called "reduced
proper nouns" to distinguish them from "real" or "true" proper
nouns which have met certain conditions of definiteness to be
discussed below. Structurally speaking, reduced proper nouns
pattern exactly in the same fashion as ordinary common nouns and
may be, in fact, definite or indefinite, depending on the dis-
course situation. We shall explore the two main types of such
reduced proper nouns.

10.2.1 <u>Reduced proper name meaning "person or thing having
the name X.</u>" One obviously very common use of a "proper name"
reduced to common noun in English indicates that the speaker is
not referring to a particular person or thing as such, but is
referring to the name itself. Thus, we can say, for example:

     a. 1. There were two <u>Mary Smiths</u> at the party last
            night.
        2. In fact, there were three <u>Marys</u> altogether.

That the name itself, and not any particular individual, is the
main topic of the sentence is evidenced further by the very

common alternate pattern in which the unambiguous form named is inserted in front of the reduced proper noun. Thus, the underlined noun phrases in the sentences in a. above could be unambiguously reworded as follows:

      b. 1. two persons named Mary Smith
         2. three persons named Mary

In Hungarian reduced common nouns may also be employed, but in structures parallel to those in b. and not in a. The tendency in Hungarian to prepose qualifiers is followed in this instance also:

      c. 1. két Mary Smith nevű lány
         2. három Mary nevű lány

Such common nouns based on proper names--as is the case with all common nouns--may occur in the singular, of course, either as partitives, i.e., as one of a previously-mentioned group, or as an independent (i.e., "introductory") indefinite. As partitives the reduced proper nouns are found in much the same contrasting pattern types in English and Hungarian as given immediately above:

      d. 1. One Mary Smith was wearing a black dress.
         2. Egy Mary Smith nevű lány fekete ruhát viselt.

As independent indefinites, on the other hand, the Hungarian reduced common nouns may occur in patterns which follow the English more closely:

      e. 1. a (certain) Mr. Smith
         2. egy bizonyos Smith nevű úr

From the contrastive point of view it should be mentioned that while an "indefinite" adjective (or determiner) like certain is optional in the English construction, bizonyos 'certain' or some similar qualifier is required in the Hungarian indefinite construction. Other independent indefinite determiners may be

used in either language, of course, but the effect achieved is the same: direct reference to a particular person is circumvented, that is to say, "proper noun status" is not afforded the individual in question for various subjective reasons. The following examples, then, are also to be found:

f. 1. one Mr. Smith
   2. bizonyos Smith nevű úr

g. 1. a certain Mr. Smith
   2. valami Smith úr

h. 1. some Colonel Brown or other
   2. valamiféle Brown ezredes

It is obvious from these examples that the reduced proper nouns here all have the basic semantic import of "person named X." The examples above showed these proper-noun-based common nouns in their indefinite forms only. It goes without saying that if they are common nouns, then they may be definite also. This fact will be discussed after another widely distributed use of reduced common nouns is discussed.

10.2.2 <u>Reduced</u> <u>proper</u> <u>name</u> <u>meaning</u> "<u>person</u> <u>or</u> <u>thing</u> <u>having</u> <u>the</u> <u>qualities</u> <u>of</u> <u>X.</u>" Another type of reduced proper noun is to be found in both English and Hungarian. This type is used to indicate that the <u>qualities</u> of a famous person or place are being singled out, not the person or thing as an individual entity. Examples of this phenomenon are abundant at all levels of usage in English and Hungarian. Although only literary examples are given here, one need only substitute the name of a famous movie star, athlete, scientist, or what have you, into the pattern to make it applicable to practically any field of human endeavor:

167

a. 1. A Shakespeare isn't born every century.
   2. Egy Shakespeare nem minden században születik.

b. 1. They say he's another Byron.
   2. Azt mondják, hogy ő egy másik Byron.

For reasons of comparison it might be reiterated here that Hungarian often has zero instead of the indefinite article egy whenever an unspecified, indefinite noun—non-count noun or otherwise—occurs in any function in a sentence:

c. 1. Adyt látnak benne.[7]
   2. They see an Ady in him.

It will be noted that the indefinite conjugation is used here, while otherwise the definite conjugation would be expected to occur with a true proper noun as the direct object. It goes without saying that place names may also be used to indicate reference to the quality of a particular entity rather than the entity itself. Accordingly, the sentence immediately below would be considered a banality if interpreted analytically, that is, if Paris is interpreted as a "real" proper noun:

d. 1. This city is not (a) Paris. (or: This city is no Paris)
   2. Ez a város nem (egy) Párizs.

However, when viewed synthetically, that is, when Paris is interpreted correctly as a reduced proper noun, then the sentence adequately conveys the speaker's opinion in regard to the qualities of the city under discussion. The following sentence achieves the same effect:

e. 1. I wouldn't exchange my home town even for a Paris.
   2. Egy Párizsért sem cserelem az én szülővárosomat.

It is quite apparent that a Paris in the last two English sentences is equivalent in meaning to the common noun phrase "a city of the qualities of Paris," and is to be regarded as indefinite here in the same way as a city would be if it were

168

inserted into the sentence in its place. The question as to
just when a proper noun is actually definite, then, still re-
mains to be answered, and will form the concluding part of the
discussions presented in this chapter.

10.3 The status of proper nouns in the category of definiteness

As can be seen from the above discussions, a proper noun in
the strictest sense, that is, a noun actually referring to "a
particular being or thing," is ambiguous with respect to defi-
niteness, occurring sometimes with a zero determiner and unre-
stricted, and, of course, sometimes with a determiner and a re-
strictive clause. Now we have already discussed in 10.1.3 the
fact that the latter type of (real) proper noun is to be consid-
ered as definite as a "definitized" common noun with a following
restrictive clause. Just as an ordinary common noun may be def-
inite (i.e., "partial-definite") when used as a partitive or
when accompanied by its identifying sentence embedded as a re-
lative clause--the latter type of construction also makes a con-
trast of partiality vs. totality--so also may a proper noun be
restricted when two aspects of the individual person or thing
are being considered. Now it will be shown that even a true
proper noun must fulfill the very same conditions for definite-
ness as ordinary common nouns.

10.3.1 Proper nouns as definites. I believe it is clear
now that a "proper noun" in the traditonal sense, that is to
say, the category of nouns which include reduced proper nouns
and real proper nouns, may range in definiteness from independent
indefinite to definite. We may now eliminate from discussion
here those reduced proper nouns which we showed in paragraph

10.2.1 to pattern as indefinite common nouns. This leaves us
with reduced proper nouns which pattern as definites and real
proper nouns, which, as we shall see, may pattern as "total-
definites" and as "partial-definites" (see 10.1.2).

10.3.1.1 <u>Proper</u> <u>nouns</u> <u>and</u> <u>previous</u> <u>mention.</u> In order for
a (real or reduced) proper noun to be definite, its referent
must be previously identified. Just as in the case of common
nouns, this identification may stem from prior discourse, or may
be tacit mutual knowledge within the situation in which the dis-
course is taking place. Accordingly, the isolated form <u>Joe</u>, for
example, or even <u>Henry</u> <u>Jones</u>, has little more meaning than the
noun phrase <u>a</u> <u>man</u> or even <u>a</u> <u>man</u> named <u>Henry</u> <u>Jones</u>, unless the
particular individual referred to by such a name is mutually
known by the speaker and the hearer. Saying, for example, "Joe's
coming over tonight" to an audience which is not acquainted
with the individual the speaker has in mind is exactly equivalent
to saying "The man is coming over tonight" without prior identi-
fication, although, of course, both sentences are grammatically
well formed and, from the speaker's point of view, definite.
However, just as the latter sentence would evoke from the lis-
teners requests for proper identification such as "What man?" or
"Who's that?" etc., so also would the first statement induce
questions such as "Who's Joe?" or "Joe who?" In either case
the necessary identification would have to be given on the spot.
In the case of mutual acquaintances, on the other hand, no such
identification is necessary; otherwise the speaker must estab-
lish a referent in prior discourse before such a name is appre-
hended as a proper noun. This, of course, brings up the

possibility of partiality of reference vs. totality of reference
in the case of previously-mentioned proper nouns. We shall now
discuss this possibility.

10.3.1.2 <u>Proper nouns and totality</u>. As a seemingly neces-
sary corollary to the process of proper identification of proper
nouns as well as common nouns is the fact that the feature of
<u>totality</u> must be present in the subsequent reference. For ex-
ample, if there are two persons of the same name, say <u>Joe Smith</u>,
within the circle of acquaintances of a given speaker and his
audience, then the sentence "Joe Smith is coming over tonight"
is obviously ambiguous. The referent underlying the proper noun
Joe Smith is actually only partially identified. The field of
possible referents is narrowed down to two choices. Definite-
ness being such an all-pervading feature of the grammar of Eng-
lish (and Hungarian), an ambiguous statement such as the one
above would undoubtedly stimulate information-seeking questions
such as "Which Joe Smith?" or "Which one?" The answer to such
a question would again be what one must label "partial-definite,"
at best: "The Joe Smith who lives down the street," or "The one
who lives down the street." Thus, a proper noun used as a par-
titive, that is, used to refer to only some of a number of pre-
viously-mentioned or situationally identified entities, is struc-
turally no more definite than any partial-definite common noun.
As we have seen, the same determiners and the same type of re-
strictive modification are used in either case. This holds, of
course, for reduced proper nouns also when they refer to part
of collective or multiple, previously-mentioned or situationally-
identified entities.

10.3.1.3 <u>Reduced</u> <u>proper</u> <u>nouns</u> <u>as</u> <u>definites</u>. The pattern
exhibited by a partial-definite real proper noun, having <u>the</u> as
its determiner and a restrictive clause following the noun, is
almost indistinguishable from that of a reduced proper noun used
in a situation allowing definitization. While in 10.2.1 and
10.2.2 we discussed situations in which reduced common nous ap-
peared primarily as indefinites, there is always the possibility
for thse common nouns to be definitized just as ordinary common
nouns. Thus, the sentence given in the previous paragraph, "The
Joe Smith who lives down the street," could, in fact, be a con-
tinuation of a discourse in which <u>Joe</u> <u>Smith</u> occurred as a reduced
common noun in an introductory sentence sufficient for definiti-
zation. Thus, a discourse of the following type:

    a. 1. There are three Joe Smiths living in this area.
          One of them lives down the street.
      2. The Joe Smith who lives down the street is a
         doctor.

can be distinguished from one as outlined above only by the fact
that in the former instance the two individuals bearing the name
in question are <u>mutually</u> known to speaker and hearer, that is,
they have been previously identified, while the individuals as
such in the second instance are of lesser importance than the
name, although it may be argued that once the proper name <u>as</u>
<u>name</u> has been mentioned, the attention of speaker and hearer
turns to the individual bearing the name. This may be more a
philosophical problem than a linguistic one, but there are cer-
tainly examples to be found in which the distinction between re-
duced proper nouns and true proper nouns used as partitives is
clear enough to warrant the subcategorization. Thus, in the fol-
lowing examples, the meaning 'person having the name or quality

172

of the famous person named X" is present to varying degrees, as
the paraphrases in parentheses indicate, in the reduced proper
nouns, which in some instances are definite through prior iden-
tification in the discourse or are known in the situation in
which the discourse is taking place:

b. 1. There were three Marys at the party last night.
   2. The Mary who was the prettiest was the most
      popular.

This definite reduced proper noun is actually partial-definite,
of course, since it represents only a part of the multiple re-
ferent. Other examples could be given, however, in which the
reduced proper noun is unique, hence total, and, at the same
time, is so unambiguously identified in the discourse situation
as to be considered unambiguously definite:

c. 1. My Paul is smarter than your Paul. (i.e., son
      named Paul)
   2. He was considered to be the Byron of his time.
      (i.e., the poet who best exemplified the
       qualities of the famous poet named Byron)

In sentence c.1 we have an example of what is variously called
the "genitive article," "possessive adjective" or "possessive
determiner." Whichever term one uses, I believe it is reason-
able to assert that my and your are a type of definite determiner
here. Since these possessive forms will be discussed at length
in the following chapter, we may exclude them from further dis-
cussion at this time in favor of a discussion of the as it ap-
pears in c.2. This stressed determiner requires a digressive
explanation here as it shows a special use of the definite ar-
ticle as an unsupported superlative which expresses the greatest
aggregation of the best qualities expected of the type of indi-
vidual mentioned. This particular use of the definite article
is to be found in Hungarian also, according to my informant,

who furnished the following example:

> d. 1. A század elején Ady volt a magyar költő.
>   2. At the beginning of the century Ady·was the
>   Hungarian poet.

The superlative meaning attached to the definite article in c.2
above, however, should not detract from the fact that the use of
the definite article here still implies a contrast with an in-
definite reduced common noun, a Byron, or another Byron, in such
sentences as:

> e. 1. He is considered to be another Byron.
>   2. He has the romanticism of a Byron.

It goes without saying that both definite and indefinite versions
of the reduced proper noun Byron in these examples show all of
the structural characteristics of any common noun. The only ap-
parent difference is graphemic, which may detract from the ob-
vious common-nounness of the noun in question. The above ex-
amples, however, have shown that there is a variety of determiner
choices in the case of reduced proper nouns, but only a binary
choice in the case of true proper nouns, as we shall now see.

10.3.2 Real proper nouns and determiners. We have seen
that reduced proper nouns may occur with a variety of "limiting
modifiers" in English: a, the, my, another, a certain, etc.,
while true proper nouns may occur with the if the given noun is
qualified. Now aside from the fact that many place names have
a definite article as one of their regular constituents, and
that nicknames often have a determiner in them, it should be
borne in mind that the vast majority of proper names--especially
personal names--occur with zero when unqualified, in English at
any rate. A properly identified, unique or total proper noun in

particular tends to have the zero determiner in English: <u>Joe</u>, <u>Joe</u> <u>Smith</u> and the like, when the given individuals designated by the names are known by speaker and hearer. It is interesting to note that in Hungarian, on the other hand, a similarly-identified proper noun can <u>occur</u> <u>with</u> <u>the</u> <u>definite</u> <u>article</u>: <u>a</u> <u>Jóska</u> 'Joe,' <u>a</u> <u>Kovács</u> <u>Pista</u> 'Steve Smith,' and the like. To sum up: when the speaker and hearer know the identity of the individual who is designated by a given proper name in a given discourse, that proper name will generally occur with zero in English. The corresponding noun phrase equivalent in Hungarian, however, could have an optional definite article before the given proper name. With these latter details in mind, we may now propose an improved definition of "proper noun."

10.4 <u>Improved</u> <u>definition</u> <u>of</u> <u>proper</u> <u>noun</u>

After this rather lengthy discussion of various uses of so-called proper nouns, we are prepared to offer a definition of proper noun which will hopefully eliminate narrowness as to occurrence with determiners, and at the same time exclude reduced proper nouns.

10.4.1 <u>The</u> <u>basic</u> <u>definition</u>. A "real" proper noun is hereby considered to be "a noun which designates, not a quality or name as such, but a particular individual or thing which has been previously identified or is situationally (or culturally) known in the discourse context."

10.4.2 <u>Corollary</u> <u>one</u>. A real proper noun which represents the totality of its underlying referent may be designated "total-definite," and may or may not have a determiner as a regular

constituent of the name. On the other hand, a proper noun which designates only part of a previously mentioned or understood group of entities may be termed "partial-definite," and usually occurs with the definite article in English in addition to the restrictive element, which may be a relative clause.

10.4.3 _Corollary two._ Other "proper nouns" which are derived from names of individual persons or things are designated "reduced proper nouns" and are considered to be no more than common nouns, homophonous with real proper nouns, but having functions as varied as any common noun. These reduced proper nouns, of course, may be either definite or indefinite, again, as may almost any other common noun.

NOTES TO CHAPTER X

1. The entry under <u>the</u> in <u>Webster's Third New International Dictionary</u> contains many such examples scattered throughout. For Hungarian, one can consult the <u>Értelmező szótár I</u>, pages 5a and 6, where the definite article and proper noun combinations are treated in a separate section. Most of the following Hungarian examples are taken from this work.

2. Except in the case of the name of a ruler, where the qualifier is actually part of the name: <u>Elizabeth the Second</u>, <u>Charles the Fair</u>, etc.

3. This example is from Hathaway (1967:106).

4. However, one can also find <u>Unknown Oman</u> by Wendell Phillips, <u>Unknown Hungary</u> by V. Tissot, etc., along with <u>The Real Ireland</u> by C.H. Bretherton.

5. It does seem to be the case that the only restrictive -- clause that may follow a <u>total</u>-definite noun phrase is a repetition of the identifying context, as in this example.

6. Another apparent "violation" of this rule is the pattern (a type of "cleft-sentence pattern") shown, for example, in the following sentence: "It is Paul who does the most work around here." An equivalent form of this sentence is "Paul is the one who does the most work around here," which more clearly shows the partial-anaphoric nature of the reference, previous mention having supplied the given multiple referent.

7. Example from Tompa (1962:158).

CHAPTER XI

POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

11.0 Introduction

Possessive constructions[1] in both English and Hungarian are
considered to be definite by three of the authors quoted in the
Introduction to this study. Smith (1964:37) even attributes a
greater degree of definiteness to possessives than to non-pos-
sessive definite nouns: "my book is more definite than the
book." Fillmore (1964:96) chooses a possessive construction of
limited syntactic variability to prove a point: "... restrictive
relative clauses are not attached to definite nouns like MY
WIFE ..." Finally, Bánhidi, Jókay, and Szabó (1965:112-13)
simply give a falsifiable generalization regarding the definite-
ness of possessives in Hungarian: "The object is considered
definite ... if the object is a noun to which a possessive suf-
fix has been added ..." It is almost a truism to say that in
linguistic analysis such unqualified generalizations as these
are bound to be falsified by almost inevitable counterexamples
of various sorts. In this chapter we will test these general
statements by examining various possessive constructions in Eng-
lish and Hungarian, and will conclude by offering for considera-
tion statements relating to the definiteness of possessives
which will account for the various counterexamples discussed
here.

Leaving aside the restricted use of possessive markers with
real or reduced proper nouns in English and Hungarian (see
10.3.1.3), for example, our beloved Paris, mi szeretett Párizsunk,
we shall deal here primarily with possessive constructions

composed of two common nouns which are in a certain syntactic relation to each other. For the sake of convenience for the interested reader, the following paradigm of Hungarian possessive forms is given together with its nearest English equivalent:

autóm	autóim	my car	my cars
autód	autóid	your (sg.) car	your cars
autója	autói	his (etc.) car	his cars
autónk	autóink	our car	our cars
autótok	autóitok	your car	your cars
autójuk	autóik	their car	their cars

It must be borne in mind, however, that the above example shows one of the most basic possessive paradigms in Hungarian and that the majority of such paradigms are much more complex morphologically. Moreover, since there is quite an extensive semantic potential to the possessive constructions in either language being studied here, it should not be surprising that interlingual possibilities for comparison and contrast are also quite numerous. Accordingly, we will not attempt an exhaustive analysis of the whole area of possessive constructions in either language. We will ignore, in particular, the morphological complexity of the various paradigms of the possessive in Hungarian,[2] and will rather select from each language those possessive patterns which we feel have the most direct bearing on the category of definiteness.

11.1 Situational identification of possessives

One of the most obvious syntactic features of the possessive construction in both English and Hungarian is the fact that they can be used to initiate an utterance and be fully comprehended, that is, they are situationally identifiable and do not necessarily require previous mention. One certainly can say, for example:

a. 1. <u>My</u> <u>father</u> is a millionaire.
or   2. <u>My</u> <u>wife</u> is a nurse.

without having to say, for example:

                b. 1. I have <u>a</u> <u>father</u>.
                2. I have <u>a</u> <u>wife</u>.

However, one feature of these particular noun phrases stands out
immediately when one is considering their relationship to the
category of definiteness, namely, they are singular, hence total,
by our cultural standards at any rate. Such noun phrases, of
course, must be considered to be total-definite through situa-
tional identification. If, on the other hand, we select a type
of noun which may readily have a plural or collective referent
underlying it, then we encounter the dichotomy which is almost
omnipresent in the category of definiteness: partiality vs.
totality of reference. From this point of view we shall now
examine several instances where less culturally-bound posses-
sives occur with the possibility of partial reference.

        11.1.1 <u>Totality</u> <u>vs.</u> <u>partiality</u> <u>of</u> <u>reference</u> <u>with</u> <u>posses-</u>
<u>sives</u>. Although possessives such as <u>my</u> <u>father</u> or <u>my</u> <u>wife</u> cer-
tainly ought to be considered definite, there is no inherent
reason why all such possessives denoting kinship should be tot-
al-definite. It goes without saying that if an individual has
more than one brother, for example, he may refer to a particular
one in contradistinction to all of the others. As we have seen
previously, this total vs. partitive distinction can be expressed
in English by the use of non-restrictive clauses vs. restrictive
clauses, the other elements in the sentence being equal. Thus,
for example, an individual with only one brother might say:

                a. 1. My brother, who lives in Chicago, is a doctor.
                    180

while another individual who has more than one could say:

        2. My brother who lives in Chicago is a doctor.

and imply, at the least, that he has a brother who does not live
in Chicago and who may or may not be a doctor. Presumably the
latter is true. To return to one of the examples of (total-
definite) possessives quoted at the beginning of this chapter,
one could find cultural situations in which my wife could also
readily occur as a partitive in the same way as my brother does
as given above. A polygamous Moslem, for example, certainly
could make a distinction between wives by the use of restrictive
modification, for example:

        b. 1. My wife who comes from X ...
compared
  to: 2. My wife who comes from Z ...

However, this is just an incidental cultural matter that should
not detract from the main point we are trying to make here,
namely, that, granted that some possessive constructions are to
be considered definite through situational identification, there
are nonetheless situations in which definite possessives in Eng-
lish are only partitives, in which case they may co-occur with
restrictive clauses, as do ordinary non-possessive noun phrases.
Hungarian also has contrasting structures in which possessives
show partial vs. total reference. However, as we have indicated
at several places in this study, the contrast between totality
and partiality is indicated, not by different clause types in
Hungarian, but rather by determiner and/or conjugation type.
The use of the definite conjugation indicates the presence of a
total-definite object, regardless of how the direct object is
otherwise marked. Conversely, the use of the indefinite conju-
gation with an object which would otherwise pattern as definite

indicates a partiality of reference. In this way the use of the indefinite conjugation in effect overrides all markers for the total-definite category with the exception of the definite article. Possessives, for example, may or may not be total-definite, but noun phrases marked with the definite article always are. Possessives not marked with the definite article, then, may contrast in definiteness, the endings of the conjugation types carrying the necessary structural difference:

c. 1. Két lovát elad<u>ta</u>. (def.) (compare: Mindkét lovát elad<u>ta</u>.
2. He sold his two horses. He sol<u>d</u> both his horses.)

d. 1. Két lovát elad<u>ott</u>. (indef.)(compare: Két lovát elad<u>ott</u>.
2. He sold two of his horses. He sol<u>d</u> two horses.)

However, the total vs. partial contrast here could be actually marked by the use of the definite article, making the use of the definite conjugation redundant, so to speak, rather than contrastive:

e. 1. A két lovát elad<u>ta</u>. (or: Mindkét lovát ...
2. He sold his two horses. ... both (of) his horses.)

The absence of the definite article with the possessive in Hungarian is therefore not an infallible indication of the exact level of definiteness of the noun phrase in question since not only total-definite and partial-definite, but also (introductory) indefinite possessives may appear with zero. (See 11.1.2). The use of the total-definite possessive without the definite article seems to be much more prevalent in written styles, especially in sentence-initial position (Bánhidi et al. 1965:149). Colloquial styles almost invariably employ the definite article before total-definite possessives, except in forms used in direct address:

f. 1. A fiam orvos.
　　　　　　　　2. My son is a doctor.

but:　　　g. 1. Hova mégy, fiam?
　　　　　　　　2. Where are you going, (my) son/boy?

For contrastive purposes it might be incidentally noted here
that the use of possessive forms in direct address is more pre-
valent in Hungarian than in English, as g.1 and g.2 indicate.
Formal speeches in Hungarian, for example, often begin with the
possessive formula Hölgyeim és uraim! '(my) ladies and gentle-
men!', and gentlemen on the street may be addressed by stran-
gers with Uram! '(my) sir!' Since these vocatives seem to be
total possessives in the discourse situation in which they are
employed, one must consider them to be total-definite, even
though such forms have a very limited syntactic range, making
it difficult to test their status of definiteness structurally.

　　11.1.2 Possessives marked with indefinite determiners.
It is quite obvious--as we have shown in previous chapters--that
partiality of reference may be indicated by means other than
restrictive modifiers in English, and the use of the indefinite
conjugation in Hungarian. One of the most notable is the use
of "indefinite" determiners. The use of such determiners with
possessives confuses the issue of establishing a structural dis-
tinction between partial-definite and indefinite, which we have
previously noted to be tenuous at best. This is particularly
true in English, where, because of the fact that possessives as
such are in a sense situationally identified at all times, par-
tiality, just as much as indefiniteness, seems to be a primary
consideration in the use of "indefinite" determiners in such
cases. In Hungarian, on the other hand, partiality may be kept

separate from indefiniteness in possessives by the use of con-
trasting determiners, as we shall see in 11.1.2.2.

11.1.2.1 _Indefinite determiners with possessives in English._
There seems to be an inseparable mixture of indefiniteness and
partiality in the use of the preposition phrase _of_ plus posses-
sive pronoun. There is certainly an indication of partiality in
such phrases as, for example: _a friend of mine, some/several/
two_ (etc.) _friends of mine_, and the like. However, native Amer-
ican-English-speaking informants agree that this pattern does
not seem to be as explicitly partitive as, for example: _one/
some/several/two_ (etc.) _of my friends_, and the like, where the
implication that the speaker has more friends than mentioned is
clearer. However, what concerns us most here is the fact that
both pattern types are equally indefinite structurally, and thus
are essentially indistinguishable--except for the type of deter-
miner used--from the partitive pattern discussed above.

11.1.2.2 _Hungarian "indefinite" possessive patterns._ Hun-
garian has an interesting choice of determiners with possessive
constructions which allows not only an indefinite-partitive, but
also a type of definite-partitive which is quite different from
the usual patterning of partitives as indefinites. As an intro-
ductory indefinite, a possessive may be marked with the indefi-
nite article _egy_, while as a partitive it may take the "posses-
sive form" of the indefinite article, _egyik. Egyik_ is like
melyik "which" in that it expressedly denotes a choice from
among a restricted or generally known number of entities, and
therefore patterns as a definite. Indeed, _egyik_ most often oc-
curs with the definite article, as in b.1, for example:

a. 1. Egy barátom érkezik ma Londonból.
   2. A friend of mine is arriving from London today.
      (*a my friend)

b. 1. Az egyik barátom érkezik ma Londonból.
   2. One of my friends is arriving from London today.
      (*the one friend of mine)

The partitiveness of egyik may be more overtly shown when this
form itself bears a possessive suffix and follows the plural re-
ferent of which it represents a part:

c. 1. a barátaim egyike
   2. one of my friends

Both (az) egyik and egyike require the use of the definite conju-
gation when used as the object of a transitive verb, while egy
does not:

but: d. 1. Azután felhívom (az) egyik osztálytársamat.
             2. Azután felhívok egy osztálytársamat.
             3. Then I'm going to call up one of my classmates.
and: 4. Then I'm going to call up a classmate of mine.

11.2 Previous mention with possessive constructions

Possessive constructions in either language may be used in
sentences which follow a prior mentioning of the referents un-
derlying the possessives. We have already seen that if the sub-
sequent reference is total, the possessive is usually marked by
the definite article in Hungarian, while the equivalent in Eng-
lish is generally marked by the use of the "possessive adjective"
("genitive article") in addition to the inability to collocate
with a restrictive clause (however, see 1.2.2 above.). Thus a
kalapom 'my hat' is total definite, by virtue of situational
identification if no previous mention has been made in regard
to the object in question. In cases where there is previous
mention, however, such previous mention takes on different formal
characteristics in the two languages being analyzed here and is

worthy of special discussion at this point in our study.

11.2.1 **English introductory possessive constructions.**
Whenever it is felt necessary to introduce a possessive in English, speakers generally make use of the indefinite article with the otherwise unmarked noun phrase. As indicated previously, the semantic range of the possessive constructions is quite extensive so that not all possible situations can be covered by example here. However, several examples should suffice to indicate several possible introductory patterns of possessive constructions used in various ways. We will at the same time give examples of subsequent reference where, it will be noted, the definite article in the place of the genitive article is also possible:

a. 1. I was wearing a hat when I came in.
   2. My/The hat is dark blue.

b. 1. We're waiting for a train.
   2. Our/The train is 20 minutes late.

c. 1. We have just formed a new club.
   2. Our/The club is open to anyone.

It can be noted that the second sentence in each pair, in addition to having the possibility of using the to indicate the definite noun phrase previously mentioned, may also serve more or less as a discourse-initiating sentence by itself if the possessive determiner is selected. The latter possibility depends, of course, on the given discourse situation.

11.2.2 **Introductory possessive constructions in Hungarian.**
In contrast to English, the Hungarian language uses introductory possessives which may already be marked as possessive:

186

a. 1. <u>Kalapom</u> van. (or: Van kalapom.)
   2. I have a <u>hat</u>.

b. 1. <u>Autóm</u> van.   (or: Van autóm.)
   2. I have a car.

It goes without saying, however, that, of the variety of uses
to which possessive constructions are put in Hungarian, the
above instances represent only a small minority of the intro-
ductory possibilities. To even attempt to list all possible
underlying structures for possessive constructions used in vary-
ing ways would require securing examples from a vast number of
fields of human endeavor. This we cannot do in such a limited
study as this, but, be that as it may, the introductory patterns
observed generally have some sort of indefinite determiner, a
notable example being zero, as we have seen. In a.1 and a.2
above, in fact, it seems that the only indefinite determiners
which could readily substitute for zero would be the quantita-
tive determiners such as <u>egy</u> 'one,' <u>két</u> 'two,' <u>néhány</u> 'several,'
etc. The above possessives, <u>kalapom</u> and <u>autóm</u>, are consequently
to be treated as indefinites since they occur in a slot which
is generally filled by indefinites only. Therefore, stating
the existence of a possessed hat, for example, by the use of
this syntactic frame is parallel to stating the existence of
any non-possessed (indefinite) noun of similar syntactic fea-
tures:

c. 1. <u>Asztal</u> van a szobában.
   2. There's <u>a table</u> in the room.

d. 1. <u>Két/néhány asztal</u> van a szobában.
   2. There are <u>two/several</u> tables in the room.

Using, on the other hand, a noun phrase--whether a possessive
or non-possessive--which is overtly marked as definite in this
frame would result in a non-grammatical pattern:

e. 1. *Az asztal van.
   2. *The table is.

f. 1. *A kalapom van.
   2. *My hat is.

The closest acceptable pattern in which definites occur would

require the use of a prefix and would accordingly differ in

meaning:

g. 1. Az asztal megvan.
   2. The table is (here/at hand/available/found, etc.).

h. 1. A kalapom megvan.
   2. I have my hat.

It is obvious then that only indefinites fill the pattern shown

in a.1 and a.2. It is quite apparent also that indefinites--

either marked for possession or not--are the forms used to in-

troduce possessive constructions in quite a few other situations.

11.3 Possessive pronouns

The forms called possessive pronouns are undoubtedly the

clearest example of possessive forms used after previous mention.

Indeed, they are total-definite anaphoric pronouns which may be

used only after previous mention has established the identity of

the entities to which they refer. Disregarding morphological

peculiarities, the following list of Hungarian possessive pro-

nouns (singular possessed) is given for the convenience of the

reader who may wish to compare these with the possessive markers

used with noun phrases given in 5.0:

az enyém	mine	(also:	kié?	whose?
a tied	yours	.	Jánosé	John's)
az övé	his/hers/its			
a miénk	ours			
a tietek	yours			
az övék	theirs			

Inasmuch as the use of the markers to indicate plural possession in Hungarian does not seem to have any additional bearing on the category of definiteness, they are left out of consideration here. Nevertheless, even from the above minimum paradigm one can observe that the total-definiteness of the Hungarian possessive pronouns is felt to such an extent that they are used only in conjunction with the definite article. This is in contrast with the optional use of the article with possessive noun phrases, as we have seen. Moreover, the definite article occurs with the possessive pronouns (except, of course, the interrogative kié?) regardless of the function the pronoun has in the sentence. If the possessive pronoun is the object of the verb, the use of the definite conjugation is called for:

a. 1. A tied ez a kalap, vagy (a) Jánosé?
   2. Is this hat yours or John's?

b. 1. Nem az enyém, hanem az övé.
   2. It's not mine, but his.

c. 1. Az enyém ott az asztalon van.
   2. Mine is there on the table.

d. 1. Nem látom a tied(et).
   2. I don't see yours.

e. 1. Kiét tartja a kezében?
   2. Whose is he holding?

To summarize the facts brought out here: the possessive pronouns in either language are total-definite anaphoric pronouns par excellence. They may be used to state the fact of ownership of an entity previously mentioned in the discourse, or obviously identified in the situation in which the discourse is taking place, as in, for example, sentences a.1 and a.2, or they may be used as total substitutes for a previously-identified noun phrase, as in the sentences in d. and e. above. Whenever they can be

189

tested structurally, they are found to pattern as total definites.

11.4 Other pronouns with possessive suffixes in Hungarian

There are other pronominal forms in Hungarian which may take possessive suffixes--often affecting their status of definiteness thereby--and which may or may not have "possessive" equivalents in English. These forms in Hungarian come under the general headings of quantitative pronouns and indefinite pronouns. The former type has already been discussed fairly extensively above. Accordingly, we need only to summarize briefly the pertinent points about these pronominal forms which have a more or less direct bearing on the category of definiteness. Then we shall conclude this chapter with a short discussion on the use of the indefinite pronouns with possessive suffixes.

11.4.1 Quantitative pronouns with possessive suffixes.

As we have shown in 6.1.6, possessive suffixes may be added to quantitative pronouns which are used in non-subject position. The possessive pronouns thus formed, e.g., kettejük 'two of them,' subsequently behave in much the same manner as possessive nouns in regard to definiteness, that is, total reference is considered definite, while partial reference is indefinite. Two examples which were already cited may illustrate this point:

a. 1. Hármónkat kiválasztott. (also hármunkat)
   2. He chose three of us.

b. 1. Kiválasztotta hármónkat. (also hármunkat)
   2. He chose all three of us.

It can be seen here that hármónkat in b.1, used in total reference, governs the use of the definite conjugation, while the similar form in a.1, which is a partitive here, takes the indefinite conjugation. The latter type of government, of course,

is the usual with all _personal_ pronouns of the first and second persons. Compare a.1 with the following sentence which also shows indefinite patterning:

c. 1. _Minket_ kiválasztott.
   2. He chose _us._

While a first person personal pronoun like _minket_ is always indefinite, and a possessive form like _hármónkat_ is definite or indefinite depending on the total or partitive relationship to its referent, there are other first person pronominal forms which are ambivalent in regard to definiteness depending on the form of the _subject_ of the transitive verb. The quantitative pronouns built on the semantically "total" stem _mindnyáj-_ 'all' when affixed with the possessive suffixes of the first or second persons may be either definite or indefinite--with no apparent contrast in meaning--when a third person subject is present (see d.1 and d.2). On the other hand, when these object forms are used with a verb which has first or second persons as the subject, then the definite conjugation is used, thus signalling the reflexive relationship:

	d.	1. Lát _mindnyájunkat._	(indef.)
or:		2. Látja _mindnyájunkat._	(def.)
		3. He sees _all of us._	

	e.	1. Látom _mindnyájunkat._	(def.)
but:		2. I see _all of us._	

As is to be expected, the third person form _mindnyájukat_ 'all of them' patterns with the definite conjugation, regardless of subject type. Partitives in the third person, on the other hand, may be formed with other quantitative pronominal stems, and show the usual partial-definite pattern that we have seen repeatedly:

191

> f. 1. <u>Kettejüket</u> kiválasztott.
> 2. He chose <u>two</u> <u>of</u> <u>them</u>.
>
> g. 1. <u>Kettejüket</u> kiválasztot<u>ta</u>. (def.) (also: Mind-
> kettejüket ...)
> 2. He chose <u>both</u> <u>of</u> <u>them</u>.

The ambivalent anaphoric nature of <u>kettejük</u>, that is partial vs.

total, is in obvious contrast to the total-anaphoric nature of

<u>mindnyájukat</u> 'all of them,' although, as we have seen, an ana-

phoric form need not be absolutely specific in order to be con-

sidered (total) definite. We have already observed that <u>melyiket</u>,

for example, consistently patterns as a definite, as does its

English equivalent <u>which</u> (<u>one</u>). It goes without saying, then,

that we can expect a definite patterning when <u>melyik</u> itself is

appended with possessive suffixes of the third person:

> h. 1. <u>Melyiküket</u> látod?
> 2. <u>Which one of them</u> do you see?

even if it is prefixed by the indefinite formative <u>vala-</u> 'some':

> i. 1. <u>Valamelyiküket</u> látom, de nem tudom, hogy hogy
> hívják.
> 2. I see (<u>some</u>) <u>one</u> <u>of</u> <u>them</u>, but I don't know his
> name.

In all of the cases in this section the English equivalents seem

to pattern as partial-definites, although other environments

would have to be created for them to test their compatibility

with restrictive clauses. However, the last three Hungarian

pronominal forms discussed here contrast, in their constant def-

initeness, with the seemingly permanent indefinite pronouns,

which, even though they may have possessive suffixes attached

to them, always pattern as indefinites.

11.4.2 <u>Indefinite</u> <u>pronouns</u> <u>with</u> <u>possessive</u> <u>suffixes</u>. In-

definite pronouns in Hungarian may also take possessive suffixes

(of all three persons), but because of the non-anaphoric nature

of the resulting pronominal forms, they still seem to pattern as indefinites. Sentence b.1 shows such an indefinite form as an object of a verb in the indefinite conjugation, while sentences c.1, d.1, e.1, and f.1 show forms of the same kind in the "indefinite" frame <u>van/nincs</u> __X__ 'there is/is not __X__,' where <u>X</u> can only be an indefinite noun phrase which usually has zero as its determiner in Hungarian, regardless of whether the noun in question is a mass-noun or not. The English equivalent, of course, generally has the indefinite article before singular count-nouns and zero before non-count nouns and also before count-nouns in the plural whenever the Hungarian verbs or nouns are marked for plural in some way. In the examples that follow it can be seen from the approximate equivalents given for each Hungarian indefinite form that there is no one good formal way in English of consistently indicating a "possessive" here as there was in the case of the possessive quantitative pronouns, most of which have a possible English equivalent in an <u>of</u>-plus-noun-phrase construction. The following list of examples represents some of the indefinite pronouns in Hungarian which may occur as possessives:[3]

a. 1. Mi bajod van fiam, <u>mid</u> fáj?   (<u>mi</u>? 'what?')
   2. What's your trouble, son? <u>What</u> hurts ((on) <u>you</u>)?

b. 1. Már láttál <u>valakid</u>(et) megérkezni? (<u>valaki</u>
                                                 'someone')
   2. Did you see <u>anyone</u> (of <u>your</u> people) arrive yet?

c. 1. Van ebben a városban <u>valakid</u>?
   2. Do <u>you</u> have <u>anyone</u> (close) in this town?

d. 1. Nincs <u>senkije</u>. (<u>senki</u> 'nobody/no one')
   2. <u>He</u> does<u>n't</u> have <u>anyone</u>. (or: <u>He</u> has <u>no one</u>.)

e. 1. Nincs <u>semmim</u>. (or: <u>Semmim</u> sincs.) (<u>semmi</u>
                                                       'nothing')
   2. <u>I</u> have <u>nothing</u>. (or: <u>I</u> do<u>n't</u> have <u>anything</u>.)

193

f. 1. Nekünk van <u>mindenünk</u>. (<u>minden</u> 'everything')
   2. <u>We</u> have <u>everything</u>.

g. 1. Fáj <u>valamid</u>? (<u>valami</u> 'something')
   2. Does <u>something</u> hurt ((on) <u>you</u>)?

In spite of the possessive suffixes, then, the above indefinite

pronouns in Hungarian still behave as indefinites in a frame in

which only indefinites can occur, or as indefinite interrogative

pronouns with no previously-mentioned or situationally understood

referent in mind.

11.5 Summary of definiteness of possessives

Although possessive noun phrases admittedly tend to be def-

inite by their very nature, there are, nevertheless, numerous

instances in which the possessive represents only part of its

underlying referent. In such a case, the possessive construc-

tion patterns as a partial-definite, that is, with possible re-

strictive clauses in English, and with the possibility of gov-

erning the use of the indefinite conjugation in Hungarian. Pro-

nouns with possessive suffixes in Hungarian, on the other hand,

vary as to status of definiteness with total vs. partial refer-

ence, the person of the object, as well as the person of the

subject (in some instances) all adding to the complexity of the

picture. Generally speaking, however, pronouns with possessive

suffixes--like their non-possessive noun phrase counterparts--

tend to pattern as definite if they are total in reference, as

partial-definite if only partial, or as indefinites if they have

no particular referent.

194

1.   Because of the enormous range of uses to which they are put, there will be no attempt made here to give an all-embracing definition, that is, "dictionary definition," of "possessive constructions" or "possessives." In both English and Hungarian the criteria will be structural, i.e., both syntactic and mor- phological. John's hat, for example, is a possessive construc- tion in English, as well as my friend and a friend of mine. The Hungarian equivalents of hat as used here, and friend, kalapja and barátom, respectively, are marked by endings called "(per- sonal) possessive suffixes," while their "possessor" nouns are often unmarked: János kalapja or Jánosnak a kalapja. Noun phrases in Hungarian which have these possessive endings on the second member will be called possessive constructions here, re- gardless of the many types of semantic interpretation they may be subjected to. Similarly, that noun in English which appears in the frame X's foot or the foot of X will be called here the possessor, for the sake of convenience. The analogous frame in Hungarian is X lába or X-nek a lába. The other noun in the pos- sessive construction will be labelled simply the possessed, and no attempt will be made to define these concepts further.

2.   The interested reader may compare several recent, com- peting morphological analyses of the possessive noun in Hungarian by reading Antal (1964) and the works cited there.

3.   Examples a. and g. are from Bánhidi et al. (1965:186), while d., e., and f. are from the same work, p. 178.

CHAPTER XII

NOUN CLAUSES

12.0 Introduction

As quoted in the Introduction to this work, a noun clause used as a direct object is considered definite in Hungarian and requires the use of the endings of the definite conjugation on the verb concerned. The English counterpart, although universally considered to be a type of noun phrase, even in traditional writings, generally speaking, has not been discussed specifically in terms of its definiteness. However, in some recent transformational-generative writings, analyses of English noun phrase complement constructions may be found in which--although it is not overtly stated--it appears that nominal clauses in English may pattern as definites in the same fashion as non-clausal noun phrases do, i.e., they may occur simultaneously with their identifying contexts. Variations in word order and positional restrictions on various elements in such "complex" sentences considerably complicate the picture in each of the two languages being studied here, a fact which makes an extensive analysis of all possible types of nominal clauses in English and Hungarian well beyond the scope of the present study. Accordingly, we shall again select only those cases of nominal clause usage which we feel are the most pertinent to the principal subject matter under investigation here, namely, the category of definiteness.

12.1 Clause as subject of the main verb

It seems simplest to illustrate the use of nominal clauses

as definites by studying sentences in which the clauses are used as overt or "real" subjects or direct objects of the main verb of the given sentence. The clauses in question could then be tested for definiteness, so far as possible, in the same manner as other noun phrases were tested in this study. We shall deal with subject uses in this section, beginning with English, and then devote the next section to an examination of the objective uses of clauses in the two languages being contrasted here.

12.1.1 <u>Noun clauses as subjects in English</u>. There are numerous well-studied examples in which noun clauses occur as subjects in English, but the status of definiteness of these clauses in such a position is almost never mentioned.[1] We will examine several typical examples of such clause usage to see what sort of rules relating to the definiteness of the clauses might be formulated. When we observe the following sentences, for example, we see that it is difficult to test for definiteness unless we manipulate equivalent patterns. However, I believe it is possible to classify the clauses in a.1 and a.2 as definite when such manipulation is completed:

a. 1. That he is here is surprising.
   2. That John did this is incredible.

These sentences seem to be equivalent to the following:

b. 1. It is surprising that he is here.
   2. It is incredible that John did this.

but not
to: c. 1. *It that he is here is surprising.
   2. *It that John did this is incredible.

although the following semantically equivalent variants certainly are possible:

197

d. 1. The fact that he is here is surprising.
   2. The fact (idea?) that John did this is incredible.

The sentences in d. show a type of construction which is remark-
ably like that found in those definite constructions which occur
with their identifying "previous mentions"--either from an in-
dependent utterance (e.1) or as a repetition or paraphrase of
the introductory context (e.2)--embedded in the same sentence:

e. 1. The story that I'm going to tell is true.
   2. The man that I saw yesterday was strange.

It can be seen, first of all, that the pattern shown in the non-
existent sentences in c. ("intermediate sentoids"), "*It that ..."
requires the deletion of it when this pronoun immediately pre-
cedes the clause complement, but not when it is associated with
the main verb as an "empty subject," as in b., for example. On
the other hand, the definite noun phrase the fact does occur in
this position, its deletion being optional, as seen in d. In-
deed, upon examining several more possible variants of the same
patterns, we must conclude that it, as used here, and the fact
are in complementary distribution on the sentence level:

f. 1. The fact that he is here is surprising.
   2. *It that he is here is surprising.

g. 1. *The fact is surprising that he is here.
   2. It is surprising that he is here.

h. 1. I am surprised by the fact that he is here.
   2. *I am surprised by it that he is here.
also: 3. I am surprised (that) he is here.

i. 1. Is the fact that he is here surprising?
   2. *Is it that he is here surprising?

j. 1. ?Is the fact surprising that he is here?
   2. Is it surprising that he is here?

It seems reasonable to assert that both it and the fact are on
the same level of definiteness, and that together they form a
construction that is as definite as the story in "The story that

-189-· 158

I'm going to tell ... " Although it is obvious that the form
that as a relative pronoun in the story that ... has a differ-
ent clausal function than the "complementizer" that in the fact
that ..., there seems to be sufficient motivation here for
treating the latter as an "introducer" of a definite nominal, a
type of apposition to a definite noun phrase, and the former as
the introducer of a definitizing relative clause. If there is
a scale of definiteness present here--and the facts are not at
all clear--it certainly is not indicated by the use of an (un-
derlying) it, as opposed to the fact, as it has been maintained.
Perhaps the most important factor in all of this--although it
is hard to formalize--is the fact that the grammatical senten-
ces contained in f. through g. are hardly capable of being used
to introduce a discourse. They all need some sort of previous
mention or situational identification to make them fully appro-
priate, even though the referent involved is not always direct-
ly identifiable as a given noun phrase. One might say that the
fact and it in complementary environments serve to summarize
the previously-mentioned material or the real-world events of
the discourse situation in one (definite) noun phrase which
may be deleted in favor of its equally definite phrase comple-
ment.

12.1.2 Noun clauses as subjects in Hungarian. When one
examines the Hungarian equivalents of the English sentences giv-
en in a. and b. of the preceding paragraph, it becomes immedi-
ately apparent that the acceptable Hungarian pattern actually
corresponds more closely to the pattern shown in c. above:

a. 1. Az, hogy itt van, meglepő.[2]
   2. Lit.: 'It that he is here (is) surprising.'

b. 1. Az, hogy János tette meg, hihetetlen.
   2. Lit.: 'It that John did it (is) incredible.'

also: c. 1. Meglepő az, hogy itt van.
        2. Lit.: 'Surprising (is) it that he is here.'

d. 1. Hihetetlen az, hogy János tette meg.
   2. Lit.: 'Incredible (is) it that John did it.'

It seems the same arguments which were used to justify classifying English subject noun phrases as definite may be used to give the same classification to the equivalent constructions in Hungarian. We have a situation in which, generally speaking, a previously-given statement is summarized by a single unifying form. This summarizing form is az in Hungarian and may be considered definite as a type of total-anaphoric pronoun even though its referent may not be a particular noun phrase in prior discourse. It may be noted here that in Hungarian the use of az before the subject noun clause is just as obligatory as the deletion of it in English in comparable sentences. When it is a matter of object clauses, on the other hand, there are other interlingual contrasts, as well as intralingual variations to describe.

12.2 Noun clauses as objects

In either language noun clauses used as direct objects behave in a somewhat different way than the corresponding clauses when used as subjects. In English the function of it or the fact becomes a little more clear, while in Hungarian the general use of the definite conjugational endings on the main verb in such instances indicates the total-definite nature of object noun clauses. I believe we may profitably examine object clauses

in the two languages more or less simultaneously, and will accordingly divide the discussion this time on the basis of the type of main verb used in the given sentence, since this affords a better opportunity to discuss certain peculiarities of some Hungarian patterns and also some variations in the equivalents in English.

12.2.1 <u>Noun</u> <u>clauses</u> <u>as</u> <u>objects</u> <u>of</u> <u>verbs</u> <u>denoting</u> <u>a</u> <u>mental</u> <u>state</u>. In this section the label "verb denoting a mental state" will be used as a cover term to designate those hard-to-characterize verbs such as <u>know</u>, <u>believe</u>, <u>think</u>, <u>maintain</u>, etc., which may be used to indicate some sort of apprehension of, or attitude toward real-world events on the part of the subject, the real-world events being symbolized by a noun phrase and/or noun clause complement. Using the same noun clauses as we did previously, we can observe several patterns in either language. For example, some verbs (of apprehension?) in English require the deletion of <u>it</u> or <u>the</u> <u>fact</u>, while, at the same time, <u>that</u> is optional:

> a. 1. I know (that) he is here.
> 2. Tudom, hogy itt van.
>
> b. 1. I think (that) John did it.
> 2. Azt hiszem, hogy János tette meg.

while other verbs (of attitude?) require the use of both the summarizing pronoun and the connective <u>that</u>:

> c. 1. I don't like it that he is here.
> 2. Nem szeretem azt, hogy itt van.

As can be seen from the examples below, inserting the elements associated with a verb from one category into a sentence containing a verb from the other category results in an ungrammatical pattern in English:

d. 1. *I know _it_ that he is here.
   2. *I don't like (that) he is here.

while in Hungarian the patterns overlap, as the translations of

the sentences in d. indicate:

e. 1. (Azt) tudom, hogy itt van.
   2. (Azt) nem szeretem, hogy itt van.

On the other hand, the deletion of the previously-mentioned noun

clause itself is possible with either sub-type of verb, in which

case _it_ may be optionally used with the first sub-type while

still being obligatory with the second:

f. 1. (Speaker A:) He is here.   Itt van.
   2. (B:) I know (_it_).   (Azt) tudon ,

g. 1. (Speaker A:) He is here.   Itt van.
   2. (B:) Yes, but I don't like   Igen, de azt én nem
       _it_.   szeretem.

Further differences in the syntactic behavior of these two sub-

types of verbs in English are exhibited by the possibility of

nominalizing the object clause:

    h. 1. I don't like his being   Nem szeretem a
        here.   jelenlétét.
     2. *I know his being here.   *Tudom a jelenlétét.
(but: 3. I know of his being here.   Tudok a jelenlétéről.)

However, regardless of which sub-type of verb we are dealing with

here, we must conclude that the clausal object of such a verb as

defined in this section is definite, as evidenced, for example,

by the use of the definite anaphoric pronoun _it_ as a substitute

for the previously-mentioned noun clause in f.2 and g.2. The

Hungarian equivalents, as indicated in the above translations,

show a somewhat similar type of sub-categorization with the ob-

vious difference that the definite endings on the main verb al-

low more deletion possibilities in Hungarian than is the case

in English. Accordingly, _azt_ or _hogy_, or the entire object

clause may be deleted, the definite verbal endings acting, so

to speak, as the anaphoric substitute for the "understood" (i.e.,
previously-mentioned and deleted) elements. These various pat-
terns in both languages as discussed here are definite, although
it certainly would be a gross oversimplification if we were to
let our discussion of noun clauses stand with just this narrow
range of possibilities coming under discussion. Accordingly, we
shall now examine another type of verb which occurs with nominal
clauses as direct objects, and then conclude this chapter by sug-
gesting further possibilities for monolingual and bilingual con-
trastive analysis in this broad syntactic area.

12.2.2 <u>Clauses</u> <u>as</u> <u>objects</u> <u>of</u> <u>verbs</u> <u>of</u> <u>reporting</u>. "Verbs
of reporting" is the broad label we will give to that fairly re-
stricted class of verbs such as <u>say</u>, <u>tell</u>, <u>answer</u>, <u>assert</u>, etc.
which serve to introduce or restate speech events either direct-
ly or indirectly. It goes without saying that such a functional
classification as this is quite arbitrary since there are border-
line cases where differentiating a "mental state" verb from a
"verb of reporting" is, strictly speaking, impossible in English,
and since, as will be shown in the sentences beginning with f.
below, almost any verb--transitive or intransitive--can be used
in Hungarian in the latter function. However, the above classi-
fication does allow us to examine object noun clauses in another
light and thereby gain further insight into the complexity of
their usage in both English and Hungarian, particularly the lat-
ter. If we once again begin our investigation here by using the
same object clauses as above for easier comparison, we may ob-
serve sentences such as the following:

a. 1. She said (that) he is here.
   2. Azt mondta, (hogy) itt van.[3]
or 3. Mondta, hogy itt van.

b. 1. She said (that) John did it.
   2. Azt mondta, (hogy) János követte el.
or 3. Mondta, hogy János követte·el.

In indirect speech the "previous mention" is so to speak pack-
aged into the noun clause, which may or may not be introduced by
a conjunction, but which, nevertheless, is to be considered as
definite as any previously-mentioned noun phrase in subsequent
occurrences. Direct speech, of course, is more or less the ex-
act rendering of the pertinent speech act of prior discourse,
and, as such, should be considered a definitized noun phrase par
excellence. Although it is very difficult to apply the same
structural test for definiteness to both simple noun phrases and
object clauses, noun clauses as direct or indirect speech do not
deviate from the test of collocatability with restrictive rela-
tive clauses in English, and with certain verbs in Hungarian.
The patterning with the definite conjugation indicates the defi-
niteness of such noun clauses, although as already mentioned, the
variety of verb types used to introduce speech in Hungarian com-
plicates the picture somewhat. The following sentences show
verbs which always require the endings of the definite conjugation
when their object is a noun clause (c., d., and e.):

c. 1. --János itt van--gondolja magában Kató.
   2. "John is here," thinks Kate to herself.

d. 1. --Itt van János--mondja Pista.
   2. "Here's John," says Steve.

e. 1. --Itt van János?--kérdezi Pista.
   2. "Is John here?" asks Steve..

These may be compared to the following sentences which show not
only obvious "verbs of reporting" but other transitive verbs as

well, and even intransitive verbs of motion. Intransitive verbs, of course, normally occur with endings of the indefinite conjugation, while the transitive verbs may vary as to conjugational endings, depending on the type of actual object they govern. Note n.1, for example, where kinál has a definite (possessive) noun as its object and therefore has the definite ending, while at the same time other verbs, such as lép elő 'step forward' (1.1) and fordul -hoz 'turn to(ward)' (h.1) are intransitive verbs of motion. As can be seen, such combinations of direct speech and introductory verbs must in some instances be translated into English by quite devious means:

f. 1. --Ki ért a geometriához?--szól Kató barátnőihez.[4]
   2. "Who understands geometry?" speaks Kate to her girl friends. (i.e., 'asks Kate of ...')

g. 1. --Pedig milyen egyszerű!--nevet Kató.
   2. "But how simple!" laughs Kate.

h. 1. --Nincs nálad fénykép róluk?--fordul Helgához Kató.
   2. "Don't you have a picture of them with you?" turns Kate to Helga. (i.e., 'asks Kate turning to Helga.')

i. 1. --Nagy Sándor vagyok--mutatkozik be a fiú.
   "I'm Alex Nagy," introduces himself the boy. (i.e., 'says the boy introducing himself.')

j. 1. --Kis Erzsébet--válaszol a leány.
   2. "Elizabeth Kis," answers the girl.

k. 1. --Hol van a ceruzám? Nincs a zsebemben!--kiált fel István.
   2. "Where is my pencil? It's not in my pocket!" shouts (out) Steve.

l. 1. --Engem nem tetszik beírni, néni?--lép elő félénken Laci.
   2. "Wouldn't you like to register me, ma'am?" steps forward shyly Laci. (i.e., 'says Laci as he steps forward shyly.')

m. 1. --Az az ablak ott az én szobámé--<u>mutat rá</u> Dénes
     az egyik ablakra.
   2. "That window there is to my room," <u>points</u> Dennis
     to one of the windows. (i.e., 'says Dennis
                              pointing to one of the
                              windows.')

n. 1. --Tessék venni egy kis süteményt!--<u>kínálja</u> Anna
     vendégeit.
   2. "Please take some pastry," <u>proffers</u> Anne her
     guests. (i.e., 'says Anne offering her guests
                      some pastry.')

Only the verb <u>kínálja</u> in n.1 has a definite ending, although <u>vá-</u>
<u>laszol</u> 'answer, reply' in j.1 could also appear with such an end-
ing in such a context, sometimes with no perceptible difference
in meaning. The verb <u>kínál</u>, it must be noted, requires that the
nouns designating the persons receiving the proffered articles
appear in the accusative while the nouns designating the articles
themselves generally appear with the instrumental -<u>val</u> suffix.
Similar in behavior to <u>válaszol</u> is the verb <u>felel</u>, which may oc-
cur with either the definite or indefinite ending after a direct
quotation:

o. 1. --Köszönöm, teát már nem kérek--<u>felel</u> Erzsébet.
   2. --Köszönöm, teát már nem kérek--(ezt) <u>feleli</u>
     Erzsébet.

Although one native informant questioned did not find any dif-
ference in essential meaning between the two Hungarian sentences
immediately above, another informant did feel that there is a
distinction to be made here, even though it is not as clear in
the above pair of contrasting sentences as it might be elsewhere.
This distinction seems to be the usual one between <u>totality</u> and
<u>partiality</u>. For the one native speaker, at least, when a direct
quotation is followed by the indefinite form of either the verb
<u>válaszol</u> or <u>felel</u>, there seems to be disunity between the noun
clause and the rest of the sentence, as if they were two separate

sentences in a narrative containing more speech material. The use of the definite conjugation, on the other hand, implies that the quotation is the total object of the verb in question. This distinction is much clearer when the verb _felel_ is used in the restricted sense 'to answer/recite in class.' With the use of the indefinite conjugation it is implied that the quoted material is only a part of the total recitation, while with the use of the definite conjugational ending it is at least implied that the quotation represents the sum total of the recitation. With the fact in mind that there seems to be a disunity between direct quotations and a "verb of reporting" such as _felel_ when used with an indefinite ending, it becomes more evident why such varied verbs as those given above could be used so readily to connect a direct quotation to the rest of the narrative in informal written styles. As a matter of fact, when one examines the short narratives from which the sample sentences were taken, one is struck by the fact that there is often no verb at all used to indicate change of speaker in cases where the context of the discourse itself is clear enough to indicate who the speaker is. One can infer from this that the primary function of the verb used in connection with a direct quotation is merely to indicate unambiguously who the speaker of the moment is, whenever the total vs. partial contrast is not felt to be important. It goes without saying that greater vividness and other stylistic results can be attained by the use of a variety of verbs with direct quotations, but this might be considered a secondary factor to the primary one of unambiguity in the speech act which is achieved by the use of the names of the given speakers as subjects of the various verbs acting as "verbs of reporting."

Needless to say, the above list of verbs used with direct quotations represents just a small sampling from one type of writing simplified for pedagogical purposes, and could be easily extended to monograph proportions. However, I believe these representative examples are sufficient to make clear the point that position alone does not serve as a proper indication of verb type in Hungarian, a fact which has a direct bearing on choice of verbal conjugation, even in instances--such as the above--where the given noun clauses must be considered equally definite, regardless of the verb type used in any one instance.

12.3 Other varieties of clause objects

Both from the descriptive-linguistic as well as the pedagogic-contrastive point of view the above discussion of noun clauses used as objects in English and Hungarian represents only a small beginning of a full analysis of the entire syntactic range of such noun clauses. Because of the limited goals set for this study, however, we must allow this matter to stand on the point just made in regard to the differentiation between partitive vs. total object, which in the case of clause objects can also be achieved by the use of the indefinite, as opposed to the definite conjugation. We may, however, suggest certain areas for further study by drawing on two short studies, one on the "factitive" verbs in Hungarian, the other on "desentential complement verbs" in English,[5] which deal with some of the syntactic possibilities of clause objects which must be explored before a fuller understanding of the definiteness of noun clauses is attained. We shall begin our discussion here with a short examination of the pertinent constructions in English.

2C8

12.3.1 <u>Desentential complement verbs in English</u>. In his
article on verbs which take desentential complements in English,
Fillmore lists on page 104 at least 76 verbs of the kind that we
have broadly labelled "verbs of reporting" and "verbs denoting a
mental state." These verbs all take a nominal clause introduced
by <u>that</u> (which is optional in most cases), but, as can be seen
from the verb first listed, <u>admit</u>, there is a great deal of over-
lapping since some verbs may take several other types of comple-
ments besides <u>that</u> clauses. The verb <u>admit</u>, for example, also
takes an -<u>ing</u> phrase nominalization, a fact which allows the op-
portunity for a fuller cross-classification of various verbs ac-
cording to their total possibilities for patterning with clause
or phrasal complements. It might prove interesting, for example,
to test whether such an attempt at a detailed classification has
any usefulness in studying the status of definiteness of the
various objects. In other words, would it be profitable to clas-
sify verbs like <u>admit</u>, for example, as "THAT-and-ING verbs" (or,
based on Fillmore's numbering, "1.5 verbs"), or <u>want</u> as a "TO-
and-telescoped future-and-telescoped copular-and-NOT-shift (or
a 5.8.11.12) verb?" For example, are the direct objects of <u>ad-
mitted</u> in these semantically equivalent (?) sentences both defi-
nite?:

      a. 1. He <u>admitted</u> that he robbed a bank.
         2. He <u>admitted</u> robbing a bank.

Perhaps one can say impressionistically that the gerund phrase of
a.2 is somehow "more definite" than the noun clause of a.1 since
the "recognizably definite" determiner <u>his</u> may be inserted before
that latter. However, there is no real structural reason for do-
ing so, since these two direct objects otherwise behave the same

way as far as definite status is concerned. Both of these ob-
jects are ultimately derivable from the same sort of previously-
mentioned utterance, regardless of the surface form one chooses
for the subsequent reference. Could the same reasoning hold also
for "objects" of verbs with other types of government, for ex-
ample, verbs which take various prepositions before such a gerund
phrase as that given above?:

b. 1. One should <u>abstain</u> <u>from</u> robbing a bank on Sunday.
2. One should <u>refrain</u> <u>from</u> robbing a bank on Sunday.
3. I don't <u>approve</u> <u>of</u> robbing a bank on Sunday.
4. He wanted to <u>arrange</u> <u>for</u> robbing a bank on Sunday.
5. His greatest pleasure <u>consists</u> <u>in/of</u> robbing a
bank on Sunday.
6. He <u>delights</u> <u>in</u> robbing a bank on Sunday.
7. He always <u>counts</u> <u>on</u> robbing a bank on Sunday.

Is "robbing a bank on Sunday" then a definite nominal in the above
sentences? Does the fact that its connection with a previously-
mentioned noun phrase of some sort is less clear here than it
would be after a "verb of reporting" such as <u>admit</u>, <u>deny</u>, etc.
or after a "verb denoting a mental state" such as <u>dislike</u>, <u>dread</u>,
<u>regret</u>, <u>remember</u>, <u>resent</u>, etc., have any effect on its definite-
ness? These questions are difficult to answer from the structur-
al point of view since the test of compatibility with relative
clauses is quite limited in such cases. Only a summarizing
clause introduced by <u>which</u> seems to occur after such a nominal.
However, since this clause is a non-restrictive clause, one must
tentatively give the label "definite" to such nominals until a
more thorough investigation of these matters is undertaken. Hun-
garian has similarly ambiguous constructions in which the appar-
ent definiteness of the given "object" is not always indicated by
a conjugational ending since the syntactic relationship involved
is often not one of verb-to-direct-object, but rather verb-to-a-

non-accusative-noun. The contrastive patterning possibilities
in English and Hungarian are especially multitudinous when there
are two objects involved, as we shall see more fully in the next
section. Here, however, we might for contrastive purposes men-
tion several well-known features of some English verbal comple-
ments which have a seemingly closer bearing on considerations of
definiteness. There are verbs in English, for example, which
take an infinitive complement whether there is a change of sub-
ject involved or not:

        c. 1. I want to go.   I want him to go.
           2. I prefer to go.   I prefer him to go.

Other verbs, on the other hand, require different patterns when
another subject is involved:

        d. 1. I don't care to   I don't care for him to go.
             go.
           2. I intend to go.   I intend for him to go.
           3. I decided to go. I decided that he should go.
           4. I am arranging to I am arranging for him to go.
             go.
           5. I mean to go.   I mean for him to go.

Some verbs, of course, may have two (or more) possible patterns:

        e. 1. I expect to go.   I expect him to go.
                           I expect that he will go.
           2. I wish to go.   I wish him to go.
                           I wish that he would go.

Cross-classifying verbs, then, as to category (or categories) of
phrasal or clausal complements they may take and also as to what
mood the verb appears in within the clause would yield enough
different pattern types to serve as the basis of a full-length
study of much greater proportions than the present study, which
treats of a greater range of syntactic patterns entering into a
discussion of the category of definiteness. Nevertheless, whether
attempting such a classification of verbs for the purpose of de-
termining the status of definiteness of the given nominals may

prove useful or not is an open question. The same holds for the
comparable situation in Hungarian, as a glance at "factitive"
verbs will show.

12.3.2 <u>Factitive verbs in Hungarian</u>. "Factitive verbs"
will be the label given those verbs in Hungarian (without the
causative suffix) which denote the initiation of an activity or
action through or by means of someone or something else. In its
broadest sense, ais term could include such verbs as <u>akar</u> 'want'
when there is a "change of subject" involved:

     a. 1. El akarok menni.   (Azt) akarom, hogy elmennjen.
        2. I want to go.   I want him to go. ('that he go')

The second pattern type is quite common in Hungarian, as "ob-
jective case as the subject of an infinitive" is generally not
the rule where factitive verbs are involved. The second sentence
in a.1 shows that a (definite) clause complement in which the
second entity involved is the subject of the second verb (often
in the imperative, but see further below) may be required to
match the English infinitive construction. The indefinite ending
on <u>akar</u> in the first sentence as opposed to the definite ending
on the same verb in the second illustrates the fact that a clause
used as a total direct object is definite, while an infinitive
as sole object is actually neuter with respect to definiteness.
Thus, while <u>akar</u> in the first sentence above has an indefinite
ending because of the (intransitive, i.e. "objectless") infini-
tive <u>menni</u> 'to go,' it may occur in the definite if the dependent
infinitive in turn has a definite object:

     b. 1. Ezt a könyvet meg akarom nézni.
        2. I want to take a look at this book.

Here we might classify "ezt a könyver megnézni" of b.1 as definite

as the clause "hogy elmenjen" of a.1. On the other hand, there are verbs in English which may take an infinitive complement in a fashion parallel to want with no change of subject, but which have equivalents in Hungarian of another pattern. This requires the use of a clause complement, even when there is not a change of subject involved. Such a clause, as a total (direct) object governs the use of the definite conjugation:

> c. 1. He decided to travel to Europe next year.
> 2. Elhatározta, hogy jövőre Europába utazik.

Such a verb, of course, would require no change in pattern when changed to a factitive verb by the inclusion of another person:

> d. 1. He decided that you should go.
> 2. Elhatárazta, hogy te utazzál el.

Needless to say, there are other types of government possible for Hungarian factitive verbs, and if one attempts to pair the possible English patterns with likely "equivalents" in Hungarian, the combinations are indeed numerous. Here we can indicate only some of the patterns occurring in Hungarian.

12.3.2.1 Pattern types with noun clauses. Earlier in this chapter we discussed several simple, clear-cut examples of noun clauses used as definite objects in Hungarian. In the case of the one-object verbs considered then, it was often a simple matter to ascertain the status of definiteness of the noun clause object. In the case of factitive verbs with clause objects, on the other hand, it is often difficult to ascertain the definiteness of the second object in many pattern types since the type of conjugational ending on the verb depends on the definiteness of the actual direct object in each particular sentence. The English equivalent, of course, often provides few or no clues

as to the identity of the "actual" direct object in the given
Hungarian sentence. Each Hungarian sentence must be viewed in-
dividually to determine the type of government required by the
given verb. For example, some Hungarian factitive verbs require
the use of the "anticipatory" pronoun az before clauses intro-
duced by hogy, as in a.l, while with other verbs it may be op-
tional, as in b.l. However, the government of the verb may be
such that this pronoun may occur in other case forms besides the
accusative. In such a case, of course, the main verb is definite
only if the first object is definite, as in a. and b., where the
anticipatory pronouns are in the ablative and sublative cases,
respectively:

 a. 1. Az orvos eltiltotta a beteget attól, hogy
    dohányozzék.[6]
  2. The doctor forbade the patient to smoke.
    (lit.: 'forbade (def.) the patient (acc.) from
    it (abl.), that he smoke.')

 b. 1. Péter (arra) biztatta a legényeket, hogy tilta-
    kozzanak.
  2. Peter encouraged the young men to protest.
    ('encouraged (def.) the young men (acc.) to
    it (subl.), that they protest')

Other verbs take first objects either in the dative (c.l), or
ablative (d.l), or sublative (e.l). In these cases the demon-
strative pronoun is optional, but, when present, it has the ac-
cusative ending, thereby governing the use of the definite con-
jugation in turn:

 c. 1. Az agronómus (azt) tanácsolta az embereknek, hogy
    dolgozzanak még jobban.
  2. The agronomist advised the people to do even
    better work. ('advised (it) (def.) (acc.) to
    the people (dat.), that they work still better.')

 d. 1. A házigazda (azt) követelte a lakótól, hogy
    fizesse ki a lakbért.
  2. The landlord demanded that the tenant pay up the
    rent. ('demanded (it) (def.) (acc.) of the
    tenant (abl.), that he pay (def.) up the rent.')

e. 1. A szövetkezet (azt) bízta rá Nagyra, hogy vegye
      meg a traktort.
   2. The co-operative commissioned Nagy to buy the
      tractor. ('entrusted (def.) (acc.) (it) to
      Nagy (subl.), that he buy (def.) the tractor.')

12.3.2.2 <u>Other pattern types</u>. The four sentences just given
show a noun clause as part of a "basic" pattern in Hungarian fac-
titive verb constructions. In addition to the fact that the noun
clause itself is derivable from a sentence embedded into the
main sentence, there are other patterns which may be derived from
a similar source. These include infinitive constructions and de-
verbal nominalizations which may be used as alternates for the
pattern with a clause "object," if, indeed, we are dealing with
an object in all instances. We shall list several examples of
the various patterns which do occur. For comparative purposes
we shall give first the clause pattern (with the clausal verb in
the imperative), then the alternate patterns, beginning with fac-
titive verbs requiring the object in the accusative:

a. 1. Az apa elküldte a fiút, hogy vadásszon.
   2. The father·sent the boy out to hunt.
      ('sent out (def.) the boy (acc.), that he hunt.')

b. 1. Az apa elküldte a fiút vadászni.
   2. The father·sent the boy out to hunt. (infinitive)

c. 1. Az apa elküldte a fiút a vadászatra.
   2. The father·sent the boy out hunting. ('sent out
      (def.) the boy (acc.) to the hunt (subl.)')

Other verbs have their first objects in the dative:

d. 1. A katona segített a fogolynak, hogy meneküljön.
   2. The soldier helped the prisoner (to) escape.
      ('helped (indef.) the prisoner (dat.), that
      he escape')

e. 1. A katona segített a fogolynak menekülni.
   2. The soldier helped the prisoner to escape.
      (infinitive)

f. 1. A katona segített a fogolynak a menekülésben.
   2. The soldier helped the prisoner in the escape.
      ('... in the escaping (inessive)')

Both <u>segített</u> and <u>meneküljön</u> in the above examples are in the in-
definite form because of the dative (rather than accusative) gov-
ernment of the former and the intransitiveness of the latter.
Can one then speak at all of the "definiteness" of the clauses
introduced by <u>hogy</u> in a.1 and d.1? Are these actually noun
clauses, or are they adverbial clauses of purpose indicating
something to the effect: 'in order that he might hunt/escape'
or 'in order for him to hunt/escape'? These and similar ques-
tions multiply when one realizes that the various combinations
of clause pattern, case forms, and infinitive patterns all add
up to a considerable variety, all of which cannot be listed here.[7]
Even deverbal nominalizations themselves may be quite varied,
with at least eight case forms possible with factitive verbs.
One example is particularly interesting and worthy of citation
here. For the sake of convenience to the reader, we shall re-
peat the related sentence with a clause pattern which we have
given previously (12.3.2.1, a.1):

        g. 1. Az orvos eltiltotta a beteget attól, hogy
            dohányozzék.
          2. The doctor forbade the patient to smoke.

also: h. 1. Az orvos eltiltotta a dohányzást a betegtől.[8]
          2. ('forbade (def.) the smoking (acc.) from the
            patient (abl.)')

and: i. 1. Az orvos eltiltotta a beteget a dohányzástól.
          2. ('forbade (def.) the patient (acc.) from the
            smoking (abl.)')

and: j. 1. Az orvos eltiltotta a dohányzást a betegnek.
          2. ('forbade (def.) the smoking (acc.) for the
            patient (dat.)')

Here the verb is in the definite form either because of the defi-
niteness of the previously-mentioned noun phrase <u>a beteg</u> 'the
patient' (g.1 and i.1) or because of the generic, hence definite,
nature of <u>a dohányzás</u> 'smoking.' Could the latter reason be

sufficient for labelling the <u>hogy</u> clause in g.1 "definite," in
parallel fashion as its related nominalizations, which are marked
for definiteness by the definite article, in the other sentences?
Properly answering such questions requires further investigation
well beyond the scope of this study. It is hoped, however, that
the survey given in the last section of this chapter, as brief
as it is, may serve to indicate where some of the possibilities
for further research lie in a full investigation of the matter of
definiteness, not only as it relates to noun phrases, but to
other syntagmas as well.[9]

NOTES TO CHAPTER XII

1. An exception is Katz and Postal (1964), where it is re-
marked in footnote 55 that there may be a "less definite" it,
rather than the fact underlying such subject noun clauses.

2. There is a pattern in Hungarian which corresponds very
closely to the English the fact that ... construction: "A tény,
hogy a város elesett ..." 'the fact that the city fell ...'
(Hall 1944:71). However, this pattern is so subordinate in usage
to the pattern with az, hogy, that we may ignore it here.

3. It can be noted from a.2 and a.3, and also from b.2 and
b.3 that either azt or hogy may be deleted from such a sentence,
but never both.

4. This and the remaining Hungarian sentences in 12.2.2 are
taken from Bánhidi as follows: f.1 from p. 154, g.1 from p. 155,
h.1 from p. 154, i.1 from p. 141, j.1 from p. 141, l.1 from p.
186, m.1 from p. 198, n.1 from p. 154, and o.1 and o.2 from p.
159.

5. See Szabó (1967) and Fillmore (1964). Rosenbaum (1967)
treats in more detail the same structures as analyzed in Fillmore's
paper.

6. The Hungarian sentences in 12.3.2.1 and 12.3.2.2--with
the exception of h.1, i.1, and j.1--are taken from Szabó (1967:
412 ff.).

7. See Szabó (1967) for an account of the actually occur-
ring combinations.

8. This and the following two examples are based on patterns
found in Zsilka (1967:52).

9. For example, we have not dealt with "definite relative
adverbs" in English (see, e.g., Katz and Postal 1964:91 ff.).
Nor have we been able to investigate the interconnections between
definiteness, aspect, and word order in Hungarian, especially as
these relate to the use of the verbal prefixes. Examples such
as the following certainly bear investigating: "Nók is mentek
be, gyerekek is." '(Some) women and children entered,' vs. "A
nók bementek, a gyerkek is." '(Both) the women and the children
entered.' A detailed study of these phenomena in Hungarian might
be a full-length work in itself, especially if one were to com-
pare such positional contrasts with those reported for other lan-
guages, e.g., Spanish: "la linda hija de Don Pedro" vs. "la hija
linda de Don Pedro," (Stockwell et al. 1965:90) and English:
"for noun phrases with specified determiners indefiniteness is
associated with postnominal position and definiteness with pre-
nominal position" (Smith 1964:41).

218

PART THREE

MORPHO-SYNTAX

INTRODUCTION TO PART THREE

Up to this point in our study we have not dealt with morphology as such, even though it is a popularly-known fact that Hungarian is an "agglutinating" language, i.e., possesses a great variety of suffixes to express grammatical relations the equivalents of which are expressed in English and other "analytic" languages by the use of whole words. It is my opinion that the extensive suffixation of Hungarian becomes immediately apparent to any beginning student of the language and, as such, hardly needs to be mentioned, particularly in a contrastive grammar. Nevertheless, in the actual use of these inflected forms, the English-speaking student encounters difficulty because suffixation (and accentuation) in Hungarian are almost inextricably woven together with matters of syntax which have to be mastered before full effectiveness is attained in handling the language being learned. The area of grammar dealing with the interrelatedness of morphology and syntax may be called morpho-syntax, and for the purpose of easier explication will be segmented somewhat arbitrarily here into the divisions indicated in the chapter headings of Part Three. Again, since a "complete" grammar is out of the question here, areas for discussion had to be greatly restricted in number. The reader will undoubtedly be able to think of other areas of morpho-syntax in the grammars of English and Hungarian which would make interesting topics of contrastive analysis. Starting, however, with the area of Hungarian syntax which is undoubtedly the most difficult for English speakers to master, namely word order, I believe that the following analyses may prove useful.

CHAPTER XIII

SENTENCE WORD ORDER

13.0 Introduction

Up to this point in our study we have said nothing about the obvious fact that Hungarian is a highly inflected language, an "agglutinating language" in older terms, while English has relatively little inflection, that is, is an "analytic language." There is good reason for this. The fact that certain syntactic relationships usually expressed by "function words" such as prepositions, and by word order, or stress and word order in English are generally expressed by stress and suffixication in Hungarian is immediately apparent to anyone attempting to formulate or analyze even the most basic Hungarian sentence consisting of two or more elements. Interference resulting from such divergent linguistic typologies is not directly due to the agglutinating nature per se of Hungarian versus the synthetic nature of English, since, for example, there is no alternative but to translate the English phrase "in the house" by a corresponding noun in Hungarian inflected for the inessive case, generally "a házban." The difficulty is an indirect result of the highly inflected nature of Hungarian, which permits more flexibility in word order than is possible in a less inflected language. With the syntactic relationships being fairly clearly expressed by suffixation, Hungarian, like Latin, can have "free" word order within a given sentence. However, again as in Latin, the word order in Hungarian is not haphazard. It is, rather, "free" to the extent that various syntactic elements may occur in various positions with a given sentence, but with certain constraints, and with some sort of

semantic difference, even if only of emphasis, obtaining in the contrasting structures. While the interrelationships of emphasis, stress, juncture, and word order in either language are not yet fully understood, there are generalizations which may be made which may prove useful for English-speaking students studying Hungarian.

13.1 Basic order

To initiate our discussion of word order in Hungarian we will begin with an examination of simple, declarative sentences and derive more complex structures from these. The simplest procedure, in theory, at least, would presumably involve taking a "neutral" sentence as the starting-point. However, it is doubtful that such exists, since prior discourse often dictates what the focus, the emphasized element, of a given sentence is to be. The prime example of this, of course, is the question-answer dialog in which the interlocutor provides the "topic" in an interrogative sentence, and the respondent the "comment" about this topic in a declarative sentence. Although in actual conversation elliptical structures are often used, we shall start our discussion with the full constructions and will attempt to give the "most neutral" order of elements as a point of departure.

13.1.1 Sentences with two elements. The term "element" is to be here understood as a syntactic segment capable of occurring in various relative positions within a sentence. Thus, neither the nor -s in the houses are considered to be movable syntactic elements in considerations of sentence word order, although the entire syntagma the houses is. We are considering here complete sentences with two elements in Hungarian. Therefore, it becomes

necessary to remind the English-speaking student of Hungarian that even though an English sentence may have two elements, for example, a pronominal subject and a predicate, Hungarian, like Spanish and many other languages, may have both the subject and predicate expressed in the verb, which then may be called a "sentence word.' In fact, we have shown in Chapter V, that Hungarian may go even further than Spanish in this regard in that it may also incorporate a pronominal object in the verbal ending: <u>tudom</u> 'I know (it).' Therefore, we are considering at this point those Hungarian sentences in which two syntactic elements are overtly present, namely, a minimum "topic" and a minimum 'comment," a simple 'theme" and a simple "proposition" concerning it. In a "most neutral' sentence in Hungarian the topic ordinarily precedes the comment, as in English:[1]

    a. 1. Péter olvas.
       2. Peter is reading.

    b. 1. A vonat megy.
       2. The train is going.

    c. 1. Egy vonat megy.
       2. A train is going.

However, under conditions of stress other word-order possibilities occur in Hungarian which are not possible in English. These include the occurrence of the zero article with a count-noun, which regularly implies stress:

    d. 1. <u>Vonat</u> megy.
       2. A <u>train</u> is going. (It's a <u>train</u> that's going.)

Emphasis, of course, can also be placed on the predicate (or virtually any element of it, as we shall see below), in which case the word order in Hungarian usually deviates from the English:

    e. 1. <u>Megy</u> a/egy vonat.
       2. The/a train <u>is</u> (<u>indeed</u>) going.

f. 1. <u>Megy</u> vonat.
   2. A train <u>is</u> going.

If the Hungarian sentence of two elements is an equational sentence, on the other hand, then the English equivalent will have three elements, and the permutational possibilities will differ from the above. (Note that there is no copula in the Hungarian.) Again beginning from the "most neutral" order, we can have:

g. 1. A ház magas.
   2. The house is tall.

h. 1. Egy ház magas.
   2. A house is tall.

but not: i. 1. *Ház magas.
          2. 'House is tall.'

Under conditions of emphasis we may have:

j. 1. <u>Magas</u> a/egy ház.
   2. The/a house is <u>tall</u>.

but not: k. 1. *<u>Magas</u> ház.
          2. 'Tall house.'

although, of course, the latter ungrammatical sentence is an acceptable sequence for a noun phrase.

We have used the expression "most neutral" above for good reason, for, as mentioned before, the favored position of stressed elements in Hungarian is immediately before the verb.[2] However, the stress placed on a subject in a two-element sentence may vary from "very slight" to "very strong" without a change of word order, the English equivalents employing pulmonary stress or different emphatic constructions:

l. 1. <u>Péter</u> olvas.
   2. <u>Peter</u> is reading.
or: 3. It's <u>Peter</u> who's reading.
or: 4. <u>Peter</u> is the one who's reading.

In a sentence of three elements, on the other hand, there are possibilities of emphasizing the subject more strongly in non-

initial position, since the permutational possibilities are increased threefold. In sentences with four elements the variants are increased to twenty-four theoretical possibilities, although some of the orders might be labelled marginal. It would serve little purpose to go beyond this number in our discussion here, since the number of dubious cases would be increased correspondingly.

13.1.2 <u>Sentences</u> <u>with</u> <u>three</u> <u>or</u> <u>four</u> <u>elements</u>. In discussing sentences with three or more elements we are still dealing with a simple topic, but there is more than one element in the comment. Each of the latter elements can be permuted independently in relation to the topic so that we can have six possible variants of sentences with three elements, and twenty-four of sentences with four syntactic elements. Again the use of the zero article places restrictions on some variants, while other variants are marginal in that they require broader contexts for fuller acceptability. To begin with a sentence of three elements, we may select either 1) a transititve verb with object, 2) an intransitive one with adverbial complement, or 3) a copula with a predicate adjective, predicate noun, or a locative. Each of these types has its syntactic peculiarities.

13.2 <u>Sentences</u> <u>with</u> <u>transitive</u> <u>verbs</u>

In viewing Hungarian sentences consisting of S(ubject), V(erb), and O(bject) it is not entirely clear whether SVO or SOV is the "preferred" basic order. For our purposes here we will begin our discussion with the basic sentence given in a. below:

    a. 1. Péter olvassa a levelet.
       2. Peter is reading the letter.

While there is a very weak stress on <u>Peter</u> in a.1, much stronger stress can be attained in non-initial, preverbal position:

      b. 1. A levelet <u>Péter</u> olvassa.
         2. <u>Peter</u> is the one who is reading the letter.

Absolute final position is not a possible stress position for S or O since the necessary preverbal position is thereby lost, the stress accordingly shifting to some other element in the sentence. Placing the emphasis on O results in the following two permutations, weaker stress occurring in c.1 than in d.1:

      c. 1. Péter a <u>levelet</u> olvassa.
         2. Peter is reading the <u>letter</u>.

      d. 1. A <u>levelet</u> olvassa Péter.
         2. It's the <u>letter</u> that Peter's reading.

Since the element immediately preceding the verb is the stressed element in a given sentence, it follows that the only position in which the verb itself can receive full stress is in initial position. There are, of course, two possible variants here:

      e. 1. <u>Olvassa</u> Péter a levelet.
         2. Peter <u>is</u> reading the letter.

      f. 1. <u>Olvassa</u> a levelet Péter.
         2. Peter is in the process of reading the letter.

Object noun phrases with ∅ or <u>egy</u> are also possible here in all permutations, however, with a change of meaning in the case of emphasized O with zero. The English translation given below attempts to capture the generic nature of this semantic change:

      g. 1. Péter <u>levelet</u> olvas.
         2. <u>Levelet</u> olvas Péter.
         3. Peter reads letters.
or: 4. Peter is a letter-reader.

    13.2.1 <u>Sentences with intransitive verbs</u>. Sentences with three elements in which the V is intransitive have the same permutational possibilities as above except that at least two of the

resulting variants are questionable (marked ?) below as they

stand in isolation:

> a. 1. A vonat megy gyorsan.
> 2. The train is going fast.

This sentence has then the following permutations:

> b. 1. A vonat <u>gyorsan</u> megy.
> 2. <u>Gyorsan</u> megy a vonat.
> 3. <u>Gyorsan</u> <u>a vonat</u> megy.
> 4. ?<u>Megy</u> a vonat gyorsan.
> 5. ?<u>Megy</u> gyorsan a vonat.

As interrogative sentences the last two examples would be fully

acceptable, but with the meaning "Can the train go fast?" i.e.

"Is it a fast train?"

13.2.2 <u>Sentences with copula</u>. If the verb in a Hungarian

three-element sentence is the copula <u>van</u> 'is,' then the number of

acceptable permutations may decrease:

> a. 1. Péter van otthon.
> 2. Peter is at home.

also: b. 1. Péter <u>otthon</u> van.
> 2. <u>Otthon</u> van Péter.
> 3. <u>Otthon</u> Péter van.
> 4. *<u>Van</u> Péter otthon.   (These may be acceptable in
> 5. *<u>Van</u> otthon Péter.   the meaning "There is a
> (person named) Peter at
> home.")

However, if the verb is in the past, then acceptable variants of

b.4 and b.5 result:

> c. 1. <u>Volt</u> Péter otthon.
> 2. <u>Volt</u> otthon Péter.
> 3. Peter <u>was</u> at home.   (i.e., Peter <u>did</u> come for a
> visit.)

If, on the other hand, the element following the verb is a predi-

cate adjective, then the permutation with the verb in initial po-

sition is unacceptable regardless of the tense of the verb in

question. Thus we have:

d. 1. A ház volt magas.
               2. The house was tall.

and   e. 1. A ház <u>magas</u> volt.
               2. <u>Magas</u> volt a ház.
               3. <u>Magas</u> <u>a ház</u> volt.
but not: 4. *<u>Volt</u> a ház magas.
               5. *<u>Volt</u> magas a ház.

It must be noted here that while the copula in a Hungarian equa-
tional sentence such as the above is mandatorily deleted in the
present tense (third person only), the past-tense form of the
verb is required in the surface structure to convey the notion of
tense, if for no other reason. It must be further noted that if
the element following the copula is a predicate noun, then correct
sentences again result from the placing of the copula in initial
position, as was the case in c. above:

            f. 1. <u>Volt</u> Péter katona.
               2. <u>Volt</u> katona Péter.
               3. Peter <u>was</u> a soldier.

However, it is not clear whether the grammaticality of c. and f.
results from the tense of the verb and the nature of the predi-
cate, respectively, or from the proper-noun status of the S.

        One more aspect of equational sentences in Hungarian must
be mentioned at this point, namely that indefinite noun phrases
are also possible for S, with, however, differences in grammati-
cality. While the sentences with <u>egy ház</u> instead of <u>a ház</u>, as
in e., would result in the very same type of unacceptable sen-
tences, those with zero would be <u>all</u> ungrammatical. Thus, while
we can have:

            g. 1. <u>Egy ház</u> <u>magas</u> volt.
               2. <u>Egy ház</u> volt magas.

and the like, we cannot have:

            h. 1. *Ház magas volt.
or: 2. *Ház volt magas.

or any of the other four possibilities.

13.3 Sentences with four elements

Sentences with four elements may be treated basically in the
same manner as sentences with three elements, except for the ob-
vious fact that there are considerably more variants possible,
both in permutations and degrees of stress. As the latter phe-
nomena are not fully understood as yet, we will concentrate our
attentions here on permutations resulting from primary stress
placement which will be marked by underscoring. Starting with
the "most neutral" sentence with a simple topic and a three-part
comment in SVO order, we get:

a. 1. Péter olvassa a levelet gyorsan.   Peter is read-
   2. Péter olvassa gyorsan a levelet.   ing the let-
   3. Péter a levelet gyorsan olvassa.   ter rapidly,
   4. Péter a levelet olvassa gyorsan.   etc.
   5. Péter gyorsan a levelet olvassa.
   6. Péter gyorsan olvassa a levelet.

b. 1. A levelet olvassa gyorsan Péter.
   2. A levelet olvassa Péter gyorsan.
   3. A levelet Péter olvassa gyorsan.
   4. A levelet Péter gyorsan olvassa.
   5. A levelet gyorsan Péter olvassa.
   6. A levelet gyorsan olvassa Péter.

c. 1. Olvassa Péter a levelet gyorsan.   Peter is in
   2. Olvassa Péter gyorsan a levelet.   the process
   3. Olvassa a levelet Péter gyorsan.   of reading
   4. Olvassa a levelet gyorsan Péter.   the letter
   5. Olvassa gyorsan Péter a levelet.   rapidly.
   6. Olvassa gyorsan a levelet Péter.

d. 1. Gyorsan Péter olvassa a levelet.
   2. Gyorsan Péter a levelet olvassa.
   3. Gyorsan olvassa Péter a levelet.
   4. Gyorsan olvassa a levelet Péter.
   5. Gyorsan a levelet Péter olvassa.
   6. Gyorsan a levelet olvassa Péter.

As can be seen from the above, every element in such a sentence
may be fully stressed, the V, however, only in initial, the other
elements in all positions except the last. Initial position

indicates weak stress with S, but strong stress in the case of
the other elements.   The third position is also a place of strong
stress, except, of course, for the verb.   There can be deletions
of the subject in such sentences as the above.   However, the en-
suing structures have, or, at least seem to have, the same type
of possibilities for stress as the fuller sentences:

        e. 1. A <u>levelet</u> olvassa gyorsan.   He's reading the
          2. A levelet <u>gyorsan</u> olvassa.   <u>letter</u> fast.   etc.

More could be said in regard to accent, especially "prosodic
accent" in such sentences.   However, the practicql gain for our
purposes here would be slight.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XIII

1. I owe a great deal to Dezső (1965) for much of the ana-
lysis and many of the examples used in the following sections.

2. In fact, "Fogarasi's Law" states that the word immedi-
ately preceding the verb in Hungarian is always stressed.

231

INTERROGATIVE SENTENCES

14.0 Introduction

Having discussed the order of elements in a simple, affirmative sentence in Hungarian, it is a relatively easy task to discuss the corresponding interrogative structures if one bears in mind the fact that for all practical purposes any element in a sentence may be stressed. In fact, it is easily understandable that the acceptable sentences in 13.1.3 could be the logical answers to a series of questions asking for specific information by the employment of interrogative words in the same position as the stressed elements in the declarative sentences. Moreover, like English, but to a much greater extent, Hungarian structure permits the formulation of questions by characteristic intonation alone, the linear arrangement of the elements being the same as that in the corresponding declarative sentence. We shall discuss the first-mentioned type of question first.

14.1 Questions with interrogative words

In contrasting the complete structures of interrogative sentences in English and Hungarian it is naturally necessary to take matters of intonation into consideration. However, inasmuch as all the intricacies of intonation are not yet fully understood for either language, and inasmuch as this study will not treat phonology as such, we can give only an impressionistic account of basic interrogative intonational patterns here. Suffice it to state that in both English and Hungarian the intonational pattern of declarative sentences and questions with interrogative words

is virtually the same. It is primarily the placement of the stress that varies between the interrogative and the declarative structures. Since the stress patternings in the two languages may contrast sharply from each other, it is to these that we need to devote the greater part of our attention. Starting with non-emphatic questions we find that the interrogative words themselves normally bear the main sentence stress in both languages, since it is precisely on these words that the focus of the sentence lies. In a Hungarian sentence with two elements one would expect to find the question word in initial position immediately before the predicate:

a. 1. Ki olvas?
   2. Who is reading?

b. 1. Mi az?
   2. What is that?

However, inasmuch as the place of full stress is immediately before the finite verb in a Hungarian sentence, there are, in sentences containing more than two elements, other permutational possibilities permitted which still retain the full stress on the question word. Some examples are:

c. 1. Péter <u>mit</u> olvas?
   2. <u>What is</u> Peter reading?

d. 1. Most <u>hol</u> van Péter?
   2. <u>Where is</u> Peter?

e. 1. Péter <u>hol</u> van most?
   2. <u>Where is</u> Peter now? ·

beside: f. 1. <u>Hol</u> van most Péter?
              2. <u>Where</u> is Peter now?

g. 1. <u>Hol</u> van Péter most?   etc.
   2. <u>Where</u> is Peter now?

The stress on the elements preceding the question word may vary, of course, depending on the importance the speaker attaches to

233

-224-

them in the given discourse. Stressing elements other than the subject involves placement in initial position for strongest emphasis, while for at least one native Hungarian speaker, final position is also a place of stress for adverbs, and even S, in sentences with question words. However, it is not clear whether this stress is anything more than secondary stress. Corresponding degrees of stress on the non-interrogative elements in the English equivalents may be expressed by vocal emphasis or position, the latter process often indicating the stronger degree:

h. 1. <u>Most hol</u> van Péter?.
   2. Where is Peter <u>now</u>?
   3. <u>Now</u> where is Pe<u>ter</u>?

Depending on the emphasis desired, the stressed initial segment may be followed by open juncture:

i. 1. <u>Most</u> + hol van Péter?
   2. <u>Now</u> + where is Peter?

However, beyond these few remarks, little can be said here on the interrelatedness of juncture, emphasis, intonation and position since these phenomena are very difficult to analyze in either of the two languages.

14.2 <u>Yes-no questions</u>

For the sake of our discussion we may conveniently divide yes-no questions into three types in each language: 1) those with inverted word order, 2) those with direct word order and rising intonation, and 3) those with direct word order and a tag word. These different categories show quite a few interlingual similarities, but several contrasts as well. Each category will be examined separately.

14.2.1 <u>Questions</u> <u>with</u> <u>inverted</u> <u>word</u> <u>order</u>. In addition to
the markedly different intonational contours, yes-no questions in
Hungarian differ from their English counterparts in respect to
rules of inversion as well. While Hungarian grammar allows the
inversion of the subject and of any verb construction acting as
predicate in a given sentence, English allows only the inversion
of the subject and the "full" verbs <u>be</u> and <u>have</u> (the latter only
marginally, however) and the auxiliaries of "compound" verbs.
Otherwise, the interrogative auxiliary <u>do</u> must be added and placed
before the subject. Thus, we can have in modern English:

    a. 1. <u>Is</u> John there?
       2. <u>Have</u> you any cigarettes?
       3. <u>Is</u> he going?
       4. <u>Could</u> Pete do it?

and the like, but not (in current colloquial English) *Went he?
*Drove she? or other inversions of single verb forms. The Eng-
lish-speaking student learning Hungarian must therefore convert
his rising final interrogative tone to a rising-falling one (on
the penultimate syllable) in addition to adjusting to the permu-
tation possibilities of the various elements in the Hungarian yes-
no question. While a sentence in Hungarian with two elements may
readily be made interrogative by a simple inversion of subject and
predicate, sentences of three or more elements may have the focus
placed on any element in the sentence by stress placement and
preverbal position while still retaining the yes-no intonational
contour. Thus we may readily have:

    b. 1. Olvas Péter?
       2. Is Peter reading?

    c. 1. Megy a vonat?
       2. Is the train going?

but also: d. 1. <u>A</u> <u>levelet</u> olvassa Péter?
         2. Is Peter reading the <u>letter</u>? (Is it the <u>letter</u>
                               Peter's reading?)

and:
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>e. 1.</td><td><u>Most</u> olvassa Péter a levelet?</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>2.</td><td><u>Most</u> olvassa a levelet Péter?</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>3.</td><td><u>Is</u> Peter reading the letter <u>now</u>?</td></tr>
</table>

In fact there is actually little point in speaking of "inverted word order" in Hungarian yes-no questions, since we can see that the above sentences are identical, except for intonation, to the declarative types given in the various sections of 13.1. Just as any tagmeme may be given full stress in a declarative sentence in Hungarian and given prominence by placement before the verb, so also may the same process be used in interrogation. The corresponding English structures will again vary, depending on the amount of stress on the preverbal element. This can be illustrated by several examples of simple sentences in SV or SVO order.

14.2.2 <u>Questions with direct word order</u>. While we have just indicated that from the Hungarian point of view there is no need to separate interrogative structures (or declarative) into those with direct order and all others, it may be pedagogically useful at this point to contrast question types with SV(O) order. In instances where there is no strong emphasis on any particular element, simple interrogative sentences in the two languages may match fairly well, although English seems to employ direct interrogative word order more often in instances of "echoing," in which surprise, anger, etc. are reflected in the higher pitch level of the repeated utterance. We do have, however, quite neutral questions such as the following:

a. 1. Péter olvas?
   2. Peter is reading?

b. 1. A ház magas?
   2. The house is large?

Stressing an element in such cases would usually require some

236

other type of construction in English:

        c. 1. Péter olvas?
          2. Is Peter the one who's reading? (Is it Peter
                                                 that's reading?)

However, emphasizing the subject in an instance of astonishment
or the like can involve inversion in Hungarian, but not in English:

        d. 1. Megy a vonat?
          2. The train is going?

also: e. 1. Megy vonat?
           2. Is there really a train going (there)?

However, this is a very special case, since we have seen that
stressing the non-verbal elements in a sentence in Hungarian calls
for their placement immediately before the verb. In the case of
interrogative sentences in Hungarian the same basic linear se-
quence of words may be used as in declarative sentences with only
interrogative intonation or an interrogative word needed to mark
the sentence as a question.

14.2.3 _Questions with tag-words._ Another type of interro-
gative structure using direct word order in both languages is
that in which a statement is turned into a question by means of
a tag-word requesting a _yes_ or _no_ answer regarding the truth-
value of the given statement. It is at this point in grammar
that the English-speaking student learning Hungarian has a marked
advantage over the Hungarian-speaking student studying English,
for while the latter has to learn dozens of formally-different
tags, _can't you_?, _doesn't he_?, _isn't it_?, and the like, the stu-
dent of Hungarian can get along with _ugye_? or _nem igaz_?, the
latter being the close equivalent of the German _nicht wahr_?,,the
Italian _non è vero_?, and similar expressions in many other lan-
guages. While _nem igaz_? follows the statement portion of the

sentence and is separated from it by open juncture, _ugye_ generally precedes the statement and is in closer juncture with it. Further contrasts occur both on the sociological and psychological levels in that _ugye_ may imply some degree of familiarity between speaker and listener, while the English tags do not. Furthermore _ugye_ retains the same form regardless of whether the statement is put in the positive or the negative. English tags, of course, reverse the positive or negative form of the statement while indicating the expectation of a positive answer to the positive statement and a negative reply to the negative statement, regardless of the tag marking:

a. 1. _Ugye_ Péter eljön?[1]
   2. Peter is coming, _isn't he_?

b. 1. _Ugye_ nem félsz?
   2. You aren't afraid, _are you_?

A discussion of the types of positive and negative answers that can follow such questions will be deferred until Chapter XVI, where phrasal verbs will be discussed. Here, however, we need to discuss a particle in Hungarian which may be labelled a question tag, namely the "interrogative particle" -_e_. This form, which is more often used in indirect questions, may be used to turn a statement into a question expressing slight doubt or incredulity, and since it is a distinctive marker of interrogation, the ensuing question, like those with the interrogative pronouns, does not have the characteristic rising falling intonation contour of other yes-no questions:

c. 1. Tudtok-e szerezni egy harmadik jegyet is?
   2. Can you really get a third ticket too?

Such constructions with -_e_, however, in which the predicate is questioned--which is most often the case--may be also analyzed as

inverted word order since there is no strong argument for setting
the "logical" place of the "deleted" subject. It is in indirect
questions that -e occurs most often, offering several points of
contrast with the equivalent English construction since in such
cases this interrogative particle expresses relations best rendered
in English by the conjunctions if or whether. Two examples may
suffice to illustrate this:

d. 1. Nem tudom, hogy el tudunk-e menni.
   2. I don't know whether we can go.

e. 1. Kiváncsi volt, Péter-e az a gyerek.
   2. He was wondering if that child was Peter.

Stronger doubt can be expressed by the addition of the conjunc-
tion vajon to reinforce -e:

f. 1. Nem tudom, vajon el tudunk-e menni.
   2. I don't know whether we can go or not.

This conjunction may be used in direct sentences also, with or
without -e, other construction types being necessary in English
to convey the same sort of doubt, for example:

g. 1. Vajon tudtok-e szerezni egy harmadik jegyet is?
   2. Do you suppose you could get a third ticket too?

h. 1. Szabad vajon oda elmenni idegennek is?
   2. I wonder if foreigners are allowed to go there too.

239

1. Sentences a.1 and a.2 are based upon sentences taken from Bánhidi et al. 1965:300. Sentences c.1 and g.1 are taken from the same work, p. 299. I have slightly modified some of the English translations given there. Sentence h.1 is from Tompa 1962:497.

240

CHAPTER XV

NEGATIVE SENTENCES

15.0 Introduction

Now that we have completed a basic discussion of stress and
word order in declarative and interrogative sentences in Hungari-
an, it is a relatively small matter to treat negative sentences,
since almost the identical processes are involved in all three
sentence types. The common negative particle in Hungarian, nem,
generally bears full stress and therefore precedes the verb, as
we have seen to be the case with the interrogative pronouns.
Just as with the interrogative pronouns, moreover, other elements
in a sentence with nem may be emphasized, that is, "made negative,"
in which case the negative element will immediately precede the
emphasized element, which occupies the usual emphatic position
before the verb. Therefore the predicate can be negated with
various orders of elements:

      a. 1. Nem tanulnak a fiúk, hanem beszélgetnek.
           2. The boys are not studying, but chatting.

      b. 1. Most nem tanulnak a fiúk, hanem beszélgetnek.
           2. Now the boys are not studying, but chatting.

      c. 1. A fiúk most nem tanulnak, hanem beszélgetnek.
           2. The boys are not studying now, but chatting.

and also any other element:

      d. 1. Most nem a fiúk tanulnak, hanem a lányok.
           2. Now it's not the boys who are studying, but the
               girls.

      e. 1. Nem most tanulnak a fiúk, hanem este.
           2. The boys aren't going to study now, but rather
               tonight.

      f. 1. A fiúk nem itt vannak, hanem ott.
           2. The boys aren't here, but there.

Contrasting structures in English and Hungarian display, among other things, the fact that the negative particle precedes the verb, simple or compound, in Hungarian while it follows the verb in English, which, of course, must be provided with a form of do if there is no other auxiliary already present. It seems that only be as a main verb can take not without the use of the auxiliary. However, such structures can be equally interpreted as having the negative refer to the predicate element, rather than the verb itself. In any case, the Hungarian equivalent has either the special negative verb before the locative element, or the negative particle nem immediately before the predicate adjective or noun:

g. 1. Pista nincs itt.
   2. Steve is not here.

h. 1. Pista nem beteg.
   2. Steve is not sick.

i. 1. Pista nem katona.
   2. Steve is not a soldier.

The English constructions, as given above, are somewhat emphatic or formal, unemphatic or less formal situations usually calling for the contracted forms, e.g., isn't and the like. This brings up a contrastive point within English grammar, for the contracted forms display different word order from that of the full forms in questions. The Hungarian equivalents, of course, remain the same:

but
j. 1. Isn't Steve here?
   2. Is Steve not here?   (*Is not Steve here?)
   3. Nincs itt Pista?

Questions with the uncontracted negative seem to be even more formal or "unusual" in American English than the corresponding non-interrogative structures. The negative questions in Hungarian, on the other hand, have other properties which contrast with the

equivalent constructions in English, the main one being the great
variety of permutations possible. Just as we have repeatedly
seen above with non-negative constructions, almost any element
may be questioned in a negative interrogative sentence, the only
apparent constraint being that the negative particle must always
precede the verb:

k. 1. Péter nem olvassa a levelet?
   2. Nem olvassa a levelet Péter?
   3. Isn't Peter reading the letter?

and   l. 1. Nem a levelet olvassa Péter?
         2. Isn't it the letter that Peter's reading?

15.1 Multiple negation

Modern standard English, like the other modern Germanic lan-
guages, generally accepts only one negative element in a single
clause. Hungarian, on the other hand, as well as the Romance
languages (and Shakespearian English) requires--wherever possible--
all elements in the same clause to be negative in form. This not
only involves interlingual contrasts, but intralingual variation
as well, in both English and Hungarian. Thus, while both English
and Hungarian have negative pronouns which may be used in similar
fashion in isolation, the Hungarian pronouns require that the
verb be in the negative also:

a. 1. Nem látok senkit.
   2. I don't see anyone. (also: I see no one.)

b. 1. Itt nincs semmi.
   2. There is nothing here. (There isn't anything
      here.)

c. 1. Nem megyek sehova.
   2. I'm not going anywhere. (I'm going nowhere.)

More emphatic negation can be shown in Hungarian by placing the
negative pronoun in preverbal position, however only in conjunc-
tion with the emphatic negative particle se(m) or the emphatic

243
-234-

negative copula <u>sincs(en)</u>. The equivalent structures in English
may be made emphatic by various means, one of the most common be-
ing the employment of the intensifier <u>at all</u>, either immediately
after the negative element or in clause-final position:

    d. 1. <u>Senkit</u> <u>sem</u> látok.
       2. I do<u>n't</u> see <u>anyone</u> <u>at</u> <u>all</u>. (I see <u>no</u> <u>one</u> <u>at</u> <u>all</u>.)

    e. 1. <u>Semmi</u> <u>sincs</u> itt.
       2. There is<u>n't</u> <u>anything</u> <u>at</u> <u>all</u> here. (There's <u>nothing</u>
                                          <u>at</u> <u>all</u> ...)

    f. 1. <u>Sehova</u> <u>sem</u> megyek soha.
       2. I <u>never</u> go <u>anywhere</u> <u>at</u> <u>all</u>.

Examples b.1 and e.1 above illustrate a simple but essential bit
of grammatical fact in Hungarian, namely, that <u>nem</u> + <u>van</u> is ob-.
ligatorily changed to <u>nincs(en)</u>, <u>nem</u> + <u>vannak</u> to <u>nincsenek</u>. The
corresponding "emphatic forms" are <u>sincs</u> and <u>sincsenek</u>, respec-
tively. Since <u>van</u> is used not only in locative constructions in
the third person, but in introductory possessive constructions in
all persons as well, there could be quite a variety of English
equivalents. Locative constructions were already illustrated
above. The following examples may illustrate possible possessive
construction types. We shall give an affirmative sentence for
easier comparison:

    g. 1. <u>Van</u> kocsim.
       2. I <u>do</u> have a car.

    h. 1. (Nekem) <u>nincs</u> kocsim.
       2. I <u>don't</u> <u>have</u> a car. (I have <u>no</u> car.)

    i. 1. Nekem <u>sincs</u>.
       2. I do<u>n't</u> <u>(have</u> one) <u>either</u>.
or: 3. <u>Neither</u> <u>do</u> <u>I</u>.

If we compare the affirmative counterpart of i.1, we see that
<u>sincs</u> is to <u>is</u> <u>nincs</u> as <u>nincs</u> is to <u>nem</u> <u>van</u>. Cf. <u>Nekem</u> <u>is</u> <u>van</u>.
'I have one too.' Therefore, its use is often that of a correla-
tive rather than an intensifier. There are also pairs of negative

correlative conjunctions in English and Hungarian, but before we turn to them, there are other aspects of negation in English which ought to be discussed at this point, even though the use of one of them is fairly marginal. This is the use of not + an adjective with the negative prefix un- or in- or its various allomorphs to form a weak affirmative. While in substandard or very informal speech two negatives do not make a positive, in the above (fairly formal) construction type two negatives do indeed make a positive, but an extremely weak one. In, for example, "He is not unwelcome here" the person in question is only grudgingly "welcome." A task, for example, which is "not impossible" is not very possible either. The Hungarian equivalents to these constructions, best described as marginal, may be given as follows: "Nem fogadjuk örömmel," lit. 'We don't receive him with joy.' If, on the other hand, the "double negative" construction occurs as a direct contradiction of a statement just uttered, then the two languages exhibit parallel structures, the second negation being expressed in Hungarian by a suffix however:

j. 1. This is not an impossible task.
   2. Ez nem egy lehetetlen feladat.

The other aspect of "negation" which was shown here by example, and which warrants further discussion, is the use of no as a "negative determiner." In h.2 above, for example, no car was given as an equivalent for n't ... a car. In addition to the well-known fact that "I have no car" is definitely acceptable standard while "I don't have no car" is usually labelled "substandard," it might be mentioned here that the former is considered by some speakers of American English to be more "formal" than the n't ... a. Whatever style it might belong to, a

construction like <u>no car</u> is very widespread in the language and may induce an English-speaking student learning Hungarian to overwork a superficially similar construction in Hungarian, namely, <u>semmi</u> + noun. The latter construction is quite emphatic and accordingly cannot be used in all cases where <u>no</u> + noun occurs in the corresponding English construction. This was already shown by the example in h. above. Conversely, an occurrence of <u>semmi</u> + noun might necessitate the use of additional intensifiers in English to form an acceptable equivalent, as the following examples may illustrate:

> k. 1. semmi kincsért sem   (lit. 'for no treasure even'=)
>   2. not for any money, 'not for the whole world'
>
> l. 1. semmi esetre sem   (lit. 'in no case whatever')
>   2. by no means

Another contrastive point of grammar might be mentioned at this point for it also can cause difficulty unless the student's attention is directed toward the idiomatic nature of the Hungarian construction. This is the use of <u>nem</u> before adjectives derived from numerals to denote "more than" and not the real negation of the number, for example, <u>nem egyszer</u> (lit. 'not once') = 'more than once, repeatedly.' This type of construction is quite rare in Hungarian, however, except for the combination <u>nem egy</u>:

> m. 1. <u>Nem egy</u> boldog napot töltöttek el együtt.
>   2. They spent <u>many a</u> happy day together. (*<u>not a</u> or <u>not one</u>)

15.2 <u>Negative correlative conjunctions</u>

Bilingual dictionaries generally give <u>neither-nor</u> as the equivalents of the Hungarian <u>se(m)-se(m)</u>. However, as we have seen, if the English verb is negated, then the associated elements generally are not negated in turn:

a. 1. Se igent ne mondj, se nemet.
                2. Say neither yes nor no.
or   3. Don't say either yes or no.

Thus we can have one negative in English acting as the equivalent

of three negative elements in Hungarian. In elliptical sentences

the correlative conjunctions may match one-for-one, as can all of

the negative pronouns: se jó, se rossz 'neither good nor bad.'

This parallels the use of the pronouns as responses to questions:

Senki 'nobody,' semmi 'nothing,' etc., or any of their oblique-

case forms: Senkit, etc. Incidentally, it can be seen from a.1

here that the "prohibitive particle" (negative imperative) in

Hungarian is not nem, but ne, which is closely equivalent to the

English don't: "Menj! Ne menj!" = 'Go! Don't go!' This con-

struction type will be discussed more fully in the following

chapter.

247

CHAPTER XVI

THE PHRASAL VERB

16.0 Introduction

Another aspect of Hungarian morpho-syntax in which stress
and emphasis play an important role in word order co..cerns the
use of what may be labelled "the phrasal verb." By this term is
meant that verbal combination consisting of a simplex verb used
in close connection with a "preverb" to form an entirely new
lexical item, or to give another aspectual meaning to the basic
verb. It can be expected that an English-speaking student of
Hungarian would experience a considerable amount of interference
in the process of mastering this feature of Hungarian grammar be-
cause of the somewhat close morphological resemblance of these
verb types with verb types in English consisting of a simplex
verb and an adverbial "particle" or a particle and a preposition,
for example, to give up = "to surrender," to put up with = "to
endure" and a great many others. The reader may be immediately
reminded of the verbs in German used with "separable prefixes."
However, even a student knowing German would derive very little
transference value from a knowledge of the syntax of the German
verbs with such "prefixes" when trying to apply this knowledge
to an understanding of the syntactic variability of the Hungarian
phrasal verbs since the latter deviate syntactically to a quite
marked degree from both the German and English counterparts.
Morphologically and semantically, however, the resemblance between
the Hungarian and the German phrasal verbs is remarkable, for not
only can aspectual nuances be expressed with the "older" prefixes,
but also new lexical entities created by including new items into

the open-ended class of "prefixes" or "preverbs" (<u>praeverbia</u>,
Hungarian <u>igekötő</u> lit. 'verb-binder'). Thus, we not only have
the following tri-lingual parallelism:

<u>Hungarian</u>	<u>German</u>	<u>English</u>
enni	essen	to eat
megenni	aufessen	to eat up
menni	gehen	to go
elmenni	weggehen	to go away

and the like, but also quite a few morphological divergencies as
well:

ütni	schlagen	to beat
agyonütni	totschlagen	to beat to death,
(lit. 'on the		to strike dead
brain')		
menni	gehen	to go
tönkremenni	zugrundegehen	to deteriorate, to
(lit. 'to the		get ruined
block')		

and many more. Since the acquiring of new preverbs in Hungarian
(and German) is an on-going process, practically any listing of
these new verb forms would be incomplete or would contain entries
which would be in the transitional stages, and therefore, "dis-
putable," as can often be noted in the fluctuation of orthography,
for example, <u>szert</u> <u>tesz</u> 'get hold of' but <u>tönkretesz</u> 'to ruin.'
(Cf. <u>tönkremenni</u> above.) The older, well-established prefixes,
on the other hand, are a closed set, more or less, and can be
gotten from any dictionary of Hungarian, and accordingly need
not be listed here. However, since the formation of phrasal verbs
even with the older prefixes is an extremely viable process, this
type of verbal derivation is also open-ended. Practically any
Hungarian dictionary will give many examples of such new forma-
tions as: <u>elbarikádoz</u> 'to barricade' and <u>lekritizál</u> 'to criti-
cize adversely,' "to pan," and many others. Our task here,

however, is not to analyze the morphologic or semantic properties of the phrasal verbs, which is a task more suited to a good dictionary, but rather to discuss the syntactic behavior of such verbs. It is at the level of syntax that the most interference is likely to occur rather than at the semantic level. How do the various parts of the phrasal verb behave syntactically in typical Hungarian sentences will be the question discussed in the remainder of this chapter.

16.1 Basic order of elements in the Hungarian phrasal verb

In discussing the rules of word order for the "separable" elements of the Hungarian phrasal verb, it is helpful to bear in mind the basic principle of Hungarian word order mentioned repeatedly in the previous chapter, namely that the stressed non-verbal element must immediately precede the verb. This rule can serve as an effective point of departure here, for the verbal prefix often bears the main stress and accordingly occurs immediately before the verb in Hungarian. Thus, since all words of more than one syllable in Hungarian have a strong dynamic accent on the first syllable, a new phonological, as well as semantic "word" is created by the addition of a prefix to a simplex verb and by the concomitant shift in main stress. The reduction of the primary stress on the first syllable in menni 'to eat,' for example, to secondary stress in elmenni 'to go away' is clearly reflected in the traditional orthography where the practice is to write the two-element sequence without a space between them. However, in non-contiguous preverbal position spacing is used, as it is in postverbal position. Primary stress is also the mark of the adverbial elements in the English and German phrasal verbs

also, but the syntactic behavior of these elements is somewhat more restricted than their Hungarian counterparts, as can be seen from the following discussion.

16.1.1 <u>Preverbal</u> <u>position</u> <u>of</u> <u>adverbial</u> <u>element</u>. For the purposes of the discussion here we will consider the preverbal position of the adverbial element of the phrasal verb in Hungarian to be the basic order, though it is perhaps not the most frequent statistically. While the order of the elements in the English phrasal verb can be shown in a simple paradigm, the Hungarian phrasal verb requires greater discussion because of the syntactic effects of stress and "double" stress. As is well known, the adverbial part of the English phrasal verb always follows the verb, either immediately after the main verb or immediately after the object noun phrase if the latter does not contain a clausal modifier. In the case of personal pronominal objects, however, only the latter position is possible:

a. 1. I'm going to <u>look</u> that word <u>up</u>.
   2. I'm going to <u>look</u> <u>up</u> that word.
   3. I'm going to <u>look</u> it <u>up</u>.
   4. *I'm going to <u>look</u> <u>up</u> it.

Extensive, postposed modifying elements, either adverbial or adjectival, lying outside the phrasal verb make a sentence in English unacceptable, unlike its German counterpart:

b. 1. I'm going to <u>look</u> <u>up</u> that word immediately.
   2. *I'm going to <u>look</u> that word immediately <u>up</u>.
   3. I'm going to <u>look</u> that word <u>up</u> immediately.

c. 1. I'm going to <u>look</u> <u>up</u> the word I heard this morning.
   2. *I'm going to <u>look</u> the word I heard this morning <u>up</u>.
   3. ?I'm going to <u>look</u> the word <u>up</u> that I heard this morning.

d. 1. I'm going to <u>look up</u> that word in the dictionary.
   2. I'm going to <u>look</u> that word <u>up</u> in the dictionary
   3. *I'm going to <u>look</u> that word in the dictionary
      <u>up</u>. (adv.)
   4. ?I'm going to <u>look</u> that word in the dictionary
      <u>up</u>. (adj.)

For the sake of completeness here it might be mentioned that
there are other phrasal verb types in English, the second elements
of which must be considered to be prepositions rather than adverbs,
since only preposed position with respect to the object is pos-
sible for them, regardless of the type of nominal occurring as
object.[1] Verbs with two prepositional elements can also occur:

e. 1. I <u>came across</u> a good book yesterday.
   2. *I <u>came</u> a good book <u>across</u> yesterday.

f. 1. I will not <u>put up with</u> that man any more.
   2. *I will not <u>put</u> that man <u>up with</u> any more.

Moreover, the unacceptable sentence a.4 given above would be per-
fectly acceptable if <u>up</u> were a preposition interpretable in its
basic directional meaning, as, for example, in "There's an open
elevator shaft. I'm going to look up it." The verb phrases <u>look
up the word</u> and <u>look up the chimney</u> denote two very different ac-
tivities. No more will be said here about the above phenomena as
we now proceed to a discussion of the Hungarian phrasal verb. By
contrast with the English equivalent, then, the Hungarian phrasal
verb may have the particle portion occurring before the verb.
This may occur with the particle conjoined to the verb, as men-
tioned above, or separated from it by one or two other elements.

16.1.1.1 <u>Position immediately before the verb</u>. In citation
form the verbal "prefix" is indeed prefixed. We have already
shown examples of this. New unilingual or bilingual dictionaries
of Hungarian generally cite the phrasal verb with the verbal ele-
ment in the third person singular: <u>elmegy</u> 'go away,' although

the infinitive form can be found in linguistic literature also: _elmenni_ 'to go away.' However, preverbal position is also possible within a sentence in which no particular syntagma other than the verb itself is emphasized. This can include affirmative or interrogative sentences with or without an overt subject noun phrase:

a. 1. Pista _elment_.
   2. Steve left.

b. 1. _Elment_.
   2. He left.

c. 1. _Elment_?
   2. Did he leave?

d. 1. Tessék _leülni_.
   2. Please sit down.

e. 1. Hazamegy _átöltözni_.
   2. She's going home to change (clothes).

These sentences are to be regarded as "neutral" as far as emphasis is concerned. This holds for the present participle constructions also:

f. 1. A ház _eladó_.
   2. The house is for sale.

16.1.1.2 _Non-contiguous preverbal position_. The Hungarian "preverb" may also occur before the verb, but separated from it by various auxiliary verbs and the adjective _szabad_ 'allowed, permitted,' which is treated by some speakers as an auxiliary verb capable of taking mood and tense markers. The most common auxiliaries of this type are: _van, fog, kell, lehet, akar, szeret, tud, szokott, szándékoz, tetszik, muszáj_.[2] _Van_ differs from the others by being used with the present gerund and not the infinitive, which in the case of _kell, muszáj_, and _szabad_ may have personal possessive suffixes (e.g., f.1). Typical examples are:

a. 1. Pista _el_ akar menni.[3]
   2. Steve wants to leave.

b. 1. _Ki_ fogom fizetni a számlát.
   2. I'm going to pay the bill.

253

c. 1. Ezt <u>meg</u> kell tanulni.
   2. These have to be learned.   (One must learn these.)

d. 1. <u>Le</u> szándékozom fordítani.
   2. I intend to translate it.

e. 1. A ház <u>el</u> van adva.
   2. The house is sold.

f. 1. Nekem <u>el</u> kell mennem.
   2. I have to leave.

The clitic <u>is</u> 'also, too' and its negative counterpart <u>se</u>(<u>m</u>), when reinforcing the phrasal verb, also occur between the preverb and the verb:

g. 1. <u>Meg</u> is mondom neki.
   2. I'll really tell him.

h. 1. <u>Fel</u> sem állnak.
   2. They don't even stand up.

If there are two auxiliaries employed with the phrasal verb, or if the auxiliary itself has an auxiliary, then the adverbial particle precedes both:

i. 1. Ezt <u>le</u> kell tudni írni.
   2. One has to be able to describe this.

j. 1. Ezt <u>meg</u> kellett volna tanulni.
   2. This should have been learned.

It is also possible to have a preverb both on the auxiliary and on the main verb. These phrasal-verb auxiliaries are very few in number and seem to behave syntactically in the same manner as other phrasal verbs. In this case each preverb acts independently of the other:

k. 1. Holnap <u>meg</u>próbálom <u>meg</u>tanulni a verset.
   2. I'll try to learn the poem tomorrow.

l. 1. Nem próbálom <u>meg</u> <u>meg</u>tanulni.
   2. I'm not going to try to learn it.

The preverb on the main verb, however, seems to have less variability in position, as will be indicated by further examples in section 16.1.2.1 below.   **254**

16.1.2 <u>Postverbal position of the adverbial element</u>. The postposed position of the adverbial particle of the Hungarian phrasal verb may be called the "stressed position".for it occurs when an element other than the verb or prefix is stressed in the sentence. Such stressable elements include, as we have seen in Chapter XIII, such "inherently stressed" syntagmas as the negative <u>nem</u>, the interrogative pronouns and, of course, the stressed responses to them, in addition to such considerations as imperative mood and perfective aspect.

16.1.2.1 <u>Position in negative sentences</u>. As discussed previously, the negative <u>nem</u> can apply to non-verbal elements in a given sentence, in addition to negating the verb. Compare:

a. 1. János nem megy <u>el</u>.
   2. John is not leaving.

b. 1. Nem János megy <u>el</u>, hanem Pista.
   2. It's not John but Steve who's leaving.

In instances where there is an auxiliary verb used in conjunction with a phrasal verb, the presence of the negative particle displaces the verbal prefix to its conjunctive position before the verb:

c. 1. Pista nem akar <u>el</u>menni.
   2. Steve doesn't want to leave.

d. 1. Nem kell <u>ki</u>menni.
   2. One doesn't have to go out.

e. 1. A ház még nincs <u>el</u>adva.
   2. The house isn't sold yet.

As shown above, an auxiliary may also have its own preverb, and in the case of negation of the "double phrasal verb," either phrasal verb may be negated. In this instance, however, the particle associated with the main verb does not seem to occur in postposed position, although disjoined as well as conjoined preverbal

positions are possible without a noticeable difference in meaning.
The following examples may not meet the approval of purists, but
are nonetheless common in colloquial styles:

      f. 1. Nem próbálom meg megbántani.
        2. I'm trying not to hurt her feelings.

or   g. 1. Megpróbálom nem megbántani.
        2. Meg próbálom meg nem bántani.
        3. I'll try not to hurt her feelings.

16.1.2.2 **Position after other stressed elements in the sen-
tence.** Just as any syntagma may be negated, and thereby stressed,
in Hungarian, so also can practically any element in a sentence be
questioned, and thereby stressed. The respective answers, of
course, will likewise be stressed. As we have seen in 16.1.1.1
c.1, the predicate may be questioned, in which case the verbal pre-
fix has the "basic" position: Elment? 'Did he leave?' However,
the predicate need not be the sole element in the sentence in or-
der to be questioned and stressed. Compare the placement of the
adverbial element in these senter···, then, beginning with the
stressed predicate:

a. 1. Mit csinált a katona?   What did the soldier do?
   2. A katona felugrott a   The soldier jumped onto
      vonatra.   the train.

b. 1. Ki ugrott fel a   Who jumped onto the train?
      vonatra?
   2. A katona ugrott fel a The soldier jumped onto
      vonatra   the train.

c. 1. A katona hova ugrott Where did the soldier
      fel?   jump?
   2. A katona a vonatra   The soldier jumped onto
      ugrott fel.   the train.

d. 1. Hova ugrott fel a   Where did the soldier
      katona?   jump?
   2. A vonatra ugrott fel It was on the train that
      a katona.   the soldier jumped.

e. 1. A <u>katona</u> ugrott fel   Was it <u>the soldier</u> who
      a vonatra?   jumped on the train?

   2. A <u>katona</u> ugrott fel   It was <u>the soldier</u> who
      a vonatra.   jumped on the train.

Stress, then, determines the placement of the adverbial particle

in otherwise identical sentences:

f. 1. Feri elment.   Frank left.
   2. <u>Feri</u> ment el.   Frank left.
                                     or: It was <u>Frank</u> who
                                         left.

In non-emphatic imperative situations the adverbial particle also

follows the verb, with or without the prohibitive particle <u>ne</u>:

g. 1. Menj el!
   2. Go away.

h. 1. Ne menj el!
   2. Don't go away.

Finally, imperfective aspect is associated with postverbal posi-

tion of the adverbial element, perfective with the preposed. Com-

pare the following pairs of sentences:

i. 1. <u>Visszament</u>.   He returned.
   2. Ment <u>vissza</u>.   He started back.

j. 1. <u>Szertefutottak</u> az   The people scattered.
      emberek.
   2. Futottak <u>szerte</u> az   The people were dispersing.
      emberek.

while indefiniteness is likewise associated with postposed posi-

tion, definiteness with preposed:

k. 1. Orvos ment <u>be</u>.   A doctor went in.
   2. Az orvos <u>bement</u>.   The doctor went in.

l. 1. Mennek <u>el</u> betegek.   Patients are leaving.
   2. <u>Elmennek</u> a betegek.   The patients are leaving.

16.2 <u>Syntax of the Hungarian phrasal verb in emotionally emphatic</u>

        <u>sentences</u>

     In instances where a sentence in Hungarian expresses emotion-

al emphasis, "double emphasis," the rules for positioning of the

adverbial particle of a phrasal verb are countermanded, so to speak. This involves primarily those cases in which the particle is ordinarily displaced to postverbal position, so that where unemotional stress calls for a displacement of the particle, double stress, or emotional stress, calls for another transformation returning the particle to preposed position. It would be almost equivalent to say that the double-stress transformation merely blocks the single-stress transformation, if it were not for the fact that emotional emphasis moves the particle two places instead of one under certain circumstances.

16.2.1 <u>Emphatic</u> <u>negative</u> <u>sentences</u>. While "neutral" negative sentences involve a displacement of the adverbial particle to postposed position, emphatic negative sentences call for the particle to be placed before the verb one or two places. A one-place displacement occurs in negative questions involving display of emotion rather than request for information:

    a. 1. Hát nem <u>eltö</u>rte?
       2. Well, didn't he break it?

    b. 1. Nem <u>meg</u>mondtam?
       2. Well, didn't I say so?

Preposed, conjoined adverbial particles can also be found in those instances where either the particle or the verb portion of the phrasal verb is under strong stress, actually with or without an emotional display:

    c. 1. Nem <u>ki</u>ment, <u>ki</u>dobták!
       2. He didn't go out; he was thrown out!

    d. 1. Nem <u>fel</u>ment, <u>le</u>ment.
       2. He didn't go up. He went down.

The latter construction shows stronger contrast than the otherwise equivalent:

e. 1. Nem ment <u>fel</u>, hanem <u>le</u>.
           2. He didn't go up but down.

A two-place "movement" of the adverbial particle may be illustrat-
ed in the following sentence:

        f. 1. Ő <u>el</u> nem menne az orvoshoz semmi kincsért sem.
           2. She wouldn't go to the doctor for all the money
              in the world.

We have already seen in 16.1.1.2 that emphatic negative <u>sem</u> also
can occur with the particle preceding it:

        g. 1. <u>Fel</u> sem állnak.
           2. They don't even stand up.

        h. 1. <u>El</u> sem hinnéd.
           2. You wouldn't believe it.

16.2.2 <u>Emphatic imperatives</u>. We have seen in 16.1.2.2 (g.1
and h.1) that imperatives, both positive and negative, ordinarily
have the prefix following the verb portion of a phrasal verb in
Hungarian. In imperatives showing strong emotional involvement,
on the other hand, the particle occurs in preverbal position. In
negative imperatives, "prohibitives," showing strong emotion the
particle likewise precedes the prohibitive particle <u>ne</u>. Both
types of imperatives here are on the level of threats. Compare
the following changes of word order as one proceeds from a ques-
tion to imperative to emotional command:

<u>Question</u>	<u>Imperative</u>	<u>Emotional Command</u>
Elmész?	Menj el!	Elmenj!!
Are you leaving?	Go away.	Get out of here!!
Nem mész el?	Ne menj el!	El ne menj!!
Aren't you leaving?	Don't leave.	Don't you dare
		leave!!

With the inclusion of the "long form" of the imperative, we can,
in fact, have three degrees of intensity of imperatives in Hungar-
ian:

                        259

"mild"	"normal"	"harsh"
menjél el!	menj el!	elmenj!!
you may leave	go away!	get out.of here!!

As can be seen, the syntax of the short and the long imperatives is
the same and needs no special treatment here. Needless to say, the
emotional state of the speaker uttering (or shouting) such commands
as those given in the third column would also be reflected in the
"tone of voice" employed at the time, in addition to facial expres-
sion, gestures, and the like, all of which might be more clearly
recognized by the non-native speaker of Hungarian than the subtle-
ties of syntax reflected in the location of the particle. In the
case of emotional commands with an auxiliary, the displacement of
the particle may be actually a three-place one. Compare, for ex-
ample:

    a. 1. Ne próbálj kimenni!
       2. Don't try to go out.

with: b. 1. Ki ne próbálj menni!!
            2. Don't you dare try to get out!

also: c. 1. Meg ne merd próbálni!!
            2. Don't you dare try it!

16.3 Reduplication of particles in phrasal verbs

Intensification or reiteration of action can be expressed by
the use of "double" prefixes in Hungarian. The former process com-
pares pretty well to the similar use of two adverbial particles of
somewhat opposed meaning to intensify the action of the narration.
The latter process in Hungarian consists in actually repeating the
prefixed element to convey the notion of repeated or frequentative
action, a grammatical process which has only a limited parallel in
English phrasal verbs. For the purpose of simplicity, both proces-
ses will be included under the label "reduplication."

260

16.3.1 <u>Intensification</u> <u>expressed</u> <u>by</u> "<u>double</u> <u>prefixes</u>." English and Hungarian agree in the use of two adverbial particles to convey the idea of intensification of action. Within an utterance, however, the corresponding double particles have their own syntactic peculiarities, as can be expected. Nevertheless, it can be seen from the examples below that the two elements in question behave syntactically as one in their respective sentences:

    a. 1. Itt állandóan járnak <u>ki-be</u>.
       2. People continually go <u>in</u> and <u>out</u> here.

    b. 1. Nyugtalanul sétált <u>fel-alá</u>.
       2. He walked <u>up</u> <u>and</u> <u>down</u> restlessly.

From the position of the preverbs in the Hungarian sentences, it can be seen that the adverbs of manner happen to be stressed in both cases here.

16.3.2 <u>Reduplicated</u> <u>particle</u> <u>as</u> <u>frequentative</u> <u>marker</u>. The effect achieved in Hungarian by the use of two identical preverbs in one phrasal verb cannot be duplicated in English solely by the repetition of the adverbial element in a phrasal verb. Reduplication in English, while certainly frequent in some styles of speech and writing, generally implies intensification, and not necessarily reiteration of action. The effect attained by the repeated elements in such constructions as: "Down, down he went into the abyss," and "Up! Up! And awaaay!" is not the same as expressed in the reduplicated preverb in Hungarian. The latter indicates that the action is initiated on more than one occasion, as can be seen in the following examples:

    a. 1. <u>Be</u>-bejár az irodámba.
       2. He comes to my office from time to time.

    b. 1. <u>Meg</u>-megáll, körülnéz.
       2. Now and then he stops and looks around.

c. 1. Elment, de <u>vissza-vissza</u>tekintett.
2. He left, but he kept glancing back.

16.4 <u>Preverbs in elliptical responses to yes-no questions</u>

As indicated in various sections of Chapter XIV, almost any
element in a Hungarian sentence may be questioned by the employment
of proper stress and word order. In the event the predicate of an
interrogative sentence is a phrasal verb, the prefix normally fol-
lows the verb in all instances where the whole verb or the prefix
itself is not specifically questioned. The responses to such
questions also contain elements that are stressed. Accordingly,
the responses also contain postposed particles. If, on the other
hand, the predicate itself is questioned, then both the question
and answer contain the preposed particle. In fact, both may have
the identical word order, as is the case when the subject (or other
elements) are questioned in yes-no questions. Compare the follow-
ing pairs of sentences:

    a. 1. <u>A katona</u> ugrott fel   Was it the soldier ...?
        a vonatra?
       2. <u>A katona</u> ugrott fel   It was the soldier ...
        a vonatra.

    b. 1. <u>Felugrott</u> a katona   Did the soldier jump ...?
        a vonatra?
       2. <u>Felugrott</u> a katona   The soldier did jump ...
        a vonatra.

It goes without saying, however, that in actual conversational sit-
uations speakers tend to avoid repetition of material clearly es-
tablished in the discourse. Therefore, typical answers to such
questions as those given above generally concentrate on the speci-
fic affirmative or negative nature of the response, rather than on
the mutually-known contextual material. This concentration is a-
chieved by elision of all but the most essential information--with-
in the limits of politeness, of course--in both English and

Hungarian, but with different types of grammatical elements being employed toward this end. Questioning elements other than the phrasal verb calls for elision of the whole verb in Hungarian with a contrasting structure in English. Questioning the verb, on the other hand, calls for ellipsis of all but the verb or particle, again with contrasting structures in English. For the sake of comparison we will discuss the elision of the entire predicate first.

16.4.1 <u>Elision</u> <u>of</u> <u>predicate</u> <u>in</u> <u>response</u>. A question such as a.1 above has both phonological and syntactic indications of the fact that the subject is the topic of enquiry. The English equivalent requires an entirely different type of construction from the Hungarian. The respective responses, however, obviously show the same type of constructions with only minor transformations marking the differences. The elliptical answers are likewise simple deletion transformations of the respective full responses:

full: a. 1. A <u>katona</u> ugrott fel a vonatra.
           2. It was the soldier who jumped onto the train.

          b. 1. (Igen), a katona.
           2. Yes, it was.

Since the element questioned here is a noun phrase, the affirmative answer in Hungarian may equally consist of the pronoun <u>az</u> (see 6.4.2.1.1):

          c. 1. (Igen), az.
           2. Yes, it was.

Depending on the social circumstances, <u>igen</u> or <u>yes</u> may of course suffice as polite responses here. If, on the other hand, the predicate is questioned, then there are elliptical possibilities in Hungarian which have other counterparts in English.

16.4.2 <u>Phrasal-verb</u> <u>predicate</u> <u>as</u> <u>response</u>. In instances where the predicate is questioned, the predicate in Hungarian may serve as the affirmative response. In the case of a prefixed verb there are two common possibilities:

full: a. 1. <u>Fel</u>ugrott a katona a vonatra.
     2. The soldier did jump onto the train.

     b. 1. (Igen), <u>fel</u>ugrott.
      2. Yes, he <u>did</u>.

or: c. 1. (Igen), <u>fel</u>.
      2. Yes, he <u>did</u>.

Thus we see that the adverbial particle substitutes for the phrasal verb as an affirmative response in the same way that <u>az</u> substitutes for the noun phrase in parallel situations, and, again depending on the social situation, both <u>az</u> and any of the verbal prefixes may serve as sufficiently polite answers to yes-no questions. Predicates with auxiliaries, however, may involve the inclusion of the auxiliary in the response, as in English. Thus, we have:

     d. 1. <u>El</u>jössz?   Are you coming along?
      2. <u>El</u>. .   Yes, (I am).

but: e. 1. <u>El</u> kellene mennem Should I go there?
       oda?
      2. (Igen),   Yes, you should.
       <u>el</u>(kellene).

A further interlingual contrast is noted in emphatic responses of the above type since the stressed intensifier must precede the auxiliary in English, but must follow in Hungarian. In addition, the Hungarian reply is prefixed by <u>de</u>, which in other contexts is the equivalent of <u>but</u>, but which here is a close equivalent of the French <u>mais</u> in "Mais oui," as will be shown by further examples below. Two possible emphatic answers of this type are:

     f. 1. <u>Ki</u>küldted az Did you send out the notice?
       értesítést?
      2. De <u>ki</u> ám.   I certainly did.
      3. De <u>ki</u> bizony. "I sure did."

16.4.3 <u>Negative responses with phrasal verb.</u> It is neces-
sary at this point to contrast the Hungarian affirmative answers
outlined above with their negative counterparts to note the dif-
ferences in syntactic behavior. Note the differences in the fol-
lowing:

	Affirmative	Negative
a. 1.	Felugrott a katona.	Nem ugrott <u>fel</u> a katona.
2.	The soldier did jump up.	The soldier did not jump up.
b. 1.	(Igen), <u>felugrott</u>.	(Nem), nem ugrott <u>fel</u>.
2.	Yes, he did (jump up).	No, he didn't (jump up).
c. 1.	<u>Fel</u> kellet ugrani.	Nem kellet <u>felugrania</u>.
2.	He had to jump up.	He didn't have to jump up.
d. 1.	<u>Fel</u> kellet.	Nem kellet.
2.	He had to.	He didn't have to.
e. 1.	<u>Fel</u>.	Nem.
2.	Yes, (he did).	No, (he didn't).

Sentences a.1 and b.1 are possible answers to a question formed
from the same elements as a.1, and the rest are possible answers
answering a question formed from the same elements and same se-
quence as c.1. The affirmative answers may all have <u>igen</u> as an
optional element, while the negative ones may have the sentence-
modifying <u>nem</u>, 'no,' in addition to the predicate-modifying <u>nem</u>
'not.'

16.4.4 <u>Affirmative responses to negative questions.</u> While
negative responses have the same form regardless of whether the
question was put negatively or affirmatively, positive answers to
a negative question in Hungarian exhibit one important contrastive
feature worthy of discussion here, namely the use of <u>de</u> as a mark-
er of the contradictory affirmative, generally in conjunction with
<u>igen</u>. Comparing affirmative replies to a question, first in the

265

positive, then in the negative, we may have:

a. 1. El kellene menni?   Should we go?
   2. (Igen), el kellene.   Yes, we should.
   3. (Igen), el.   Yes, (we should).

b. 1. Nem kellene elmenni?   Shouldn't we go?
   2. De igen, el kellene.   Yes, we-should.
   3. De igen, el.   Yes, we should.
   4. De igen.   Yes. (Why, yes.)

16.5 Example of literary use of phrasal verb

It may be of interest at this point to illustrate the various
patterns displayed by a phrasal verb under varying conditions of
emphasis. The following is a literary passage quoted by Sauvageot
(1951:145) which has four occurrences of the phrasal verb megtenni
'to do (it)':

> Nagyon szeretné megtenni, érzi,
> hogy meg kellene tennie, bolond is
> volna, ha nem tenné meg,--és mégis
> tudja, hogy sohasem fogja megtenni.
>
> He would like very much to do it.
> He feels he ought to do it. He
> would indeed be crazy if he didn't
> do it, and yet he knows that he'll
> never do it.

Placement of the adverbial element clearly indicates where the
points of emphasis lie.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVI

1. There are also, of course, verbs with "inseparable pre-
fixes" in English (and German). However, these do not behave syn-
tactically in any way different from a simplex verb in the respec-
tive languages. Such prefixed verbs may be contrasted, either in
jest or in earnest, with similar phrasal verbs, e.g., as in Mae
West's famous quip: "I'd rather be <u>looked</u> <u>over</u> than <u>overlooked</u>."

2. As an auxiliary verb, <u>van</u> occurs with the present gerund
to form the "statal passive": <u>A ház el van adva</u>. 'The house is
sold.' <u>Fog</u> is the auxiliary of the periphrastic future: <u>fog men-
ni</u> 'will go.' <u>Kell</u>, <u>lehet</u>, and <u>tud</u> may be labelled "modal auxili-
aries" and are often equivalent to English <u>must</u>, <u>may</u>, and <u>can</u>, re-
spectively. <u>Muszáj</u> is a colloquial equivalent of <u>kell</u>. <u>Akar</u>
'want,' <u>szeret</u> 'like,' and <u>szándékoz</u> 'intend' generally offer lit-
tle difficulty for English-speaking students. <u>Szokott</u>, on the
other hand, is past in form and therefore can be misinterpreted as
'used to' since it denotes repeated or customary action. However,
since it is used for designating present-time actions, the English
equivalents are best rendered by <u>usually/generally</u> + verb, or by
the use of the non-continuous present tense form. <u>Tetszik</u> is a
polite "filler": <u>Le tetszik ülni</u>? 'Would you care to sit down?'
<u>El tetszik menni</u>? 'Are you leaving, (sir/ma'am)?'

3. The examples given in the rest of this chapter have been
collected over a period of five years. Accordingly, it is no
longer possible to state the exact source of every sentence, es-
pecially the more colloquial ones. The examples taken from writ-
ten sources may all be documented, but since all of the sentences
have been checked by a native informant and found to be acceptable,
it was not felt necessary to list every single source. Bánhidi
and Jókay 1962:417, Bánhidi et al. 1965:275 and 399, and Tompa
1962:476 were especially useful sources for examples used in this
chapter.

267

PART FOUR

GRAMMATICAL-SEMANTIC NOTIONS

268

INTRODUCTION TO PART FOUR

We have already considered a specific syntactic area which could actually have been given a "grammatical-semantic" label, namely the category of definiteness, which, as we have seen, involves notional as well as grammatical considerations. While stress and word order involve little that could be called semantics, we may return to semantic-grammatical areas by discussing several very important features of grammar which do depend, in part, at least, on how real-world events or entities are viewed. Only three broad areas will be considered here, each of which could be discussed in a work of monograph proportions. These areas are time and tense, aspect, and number. We shall discuss them in that order.

TIME AND TENSE USAGE

17.0 Introduction

It would be a banality to say that an English-speaking student
of Hungarian would be expected to experience a considerable amount
of difficulty in attempting to "map" his elaborate native tense
system onto the relatively restricted tense system of Hungarian.
Although both languages agree in having only two "simple" tenses,
i.e., one-word forms, English has a fairly elaborate system of
verbal combinations, up to four words in length, which have only
partially corresponding equivalents in Hungarian. Moreover, the
varied uses to which one form or combination of forms may be put
pose special contrastive problems, even after one has noted what
might be the "basic" tense correspondences in the two languages
under discussion. The combination would go, for example, requires
at least three different forms as equivalents in Hungarian in such
sentences as:

a. 1. He would go there if we asked him to.
   2. He said he would go there tomorrow.
   3. Every day he would go into the same bar and order
      the same drink.

The last sentence shows another feature of English "tense" forms,
namely that they express more about the aspect of the action than
about the time, a feature, of course, quite evident in the use of
the "continuous" forms in English, various adverbials being re-
quired in Hungarian to convey more or less the same semantic im-
port. All this is in addition to the fact that moods also play an
important role in considerations of tense in English. Moreover,
the picture may be further complicated by the fact that English

has two voices in which verb forms may appear, while Hungarian, as we have seen, has two conjugations for all tense forms. Since we have dealt fairly extensively with matters pertaining to the employment of the definite conjugation, we need not elaborate any further on the latter topic. However, all of the other factors mentioned above warrant fuller discussion, beginning with the simple forms.

17.1 Simple tense forms

Leaving aside philosophical argument as to the nature of time,[1] we will assume time to be an objective reality capable of being viewed from either the internal, i.e., personal, point of view or from the external, i.e., measurable, recursive sequence of natural events. It is the first of these that reflects itself most noticeably in the tense systems of English and Hungarian, and it is here that we will concentrate most of our attention in this chapter.[2]

17.1.1 "Present tense" usage in English and Hungarian. In this section we are using the term "present tense" as a convenient label for the simple verb forms in either English or Hungarian which, among other things, are employed to designate "generic time" (Jespersen 1965:259), as in the following "timeless" statements:

 a. 1. The Earth revolves around the sun.
 2. A Föld a Nap körul kering.

 b. 1. A víz 100 foknál forr.
 2. Water boils at 100 degrees.

In addition to designating such timeless, natural events as above, the present tense forms of both English and Hungarian are used to indicate events which are habitually repeated, without any reference to laws of nature:

c. 1. Minden nap moziba <u>megy</u>.
   2. He <u>goes</u> to the movies every day.

However, in designating other types of events and their reference
to the time of the discourse, there are a considerable number of
interlingual contrasts. Indeed, it becomes quite evident that the
term "present tense" is a misnomer for these simple verb forms in
both English and Hungarian. Nor is the widespread label "non-past"
entirely satisfactory, for it is quite obvious that the forms com-
monly designated "present tense" forms may be used in reference to
<u>past</u>, <u>present</u>, and <u>future</u> time under various circumstances. It is
our intention here to view these circumstances t determine what
contrasting and what comparable processes are employed by the two
different languages under study.

17.1.1.1 "<u>Present</u> <u>tense</u>" <u>to</u> <u>designate</u> <u>past</u> <u>events</u>. In both
English and Hungarian the present tense may be employed as the so-
called "historical present" in narrating past events. This term
is also an unfortunate designation, for rather than lending a fla-
vor of antiquity, or anything of that nature, to the narrative,
this employment of the present tense lends vividness, immediacy,
to the retelling and may be more aptly called "dramatic present."
The dramatic present seems to be more common in Hungarian than in
English, where to me it smacks a little of the substandard or pro-
vincial:

a. 1. So there I <u>am</u> yesterday, walking down the street,
      when this guy <u>comes</u> up to me and <u>says</u> ...
   2. Tegnap <u>megyek</u> az utcán, amint egy illető <u>odajön</u>
      és azt <u>mondja</u>, hogy ...

The present tense can also be used to relate a past-time event in
Hungarian in reported speech if the present tense was used in the
original speech act. The tense of the equivalent in English

272

depends on the tense of the verb of reporting, a past-tense verb
usually being followed by a verb in the past tense, regardless of
the tense of the verb in the original discourse. It may serve a
useful purpose here to illustrate this interlingual contrast at
this point, although more will be said in this regard in 18.2.2 be-
low:

  b. 1. I asked what he <u>was doing</u>.
    2. (Azt) kérdeztem, hogy mit <u>csinál</u>. (pres.)

It is clear that, although the action designated by the present-
tense form <u>csinál</u> is in the past with respect to the reporting,
i.e., the second speech event, it was an on-going activity with re-
spect to the asking, the first speech event. It will be shown be-
low that the English pattern can produce anomalies when it comes to
reporting of events which are still on-going at the time of the re-
porting of the speech event.

17.1.1.2 "<u>Present tense</u>" <u>to indicate on-going events</u>. The
simple present tense form in both English and Hungarian can be used
to indicate a simple on-going event, in addition to the "timeless"
and repeated events mentioned in 17.1.1 above. However, in this
area there are so many intralingual and interlingual contrasts that
it is best to discuss this point separately. The problem here lies
in the fact that while Hungarian has only one tense to designate
present-time activities, English has the simple present, the pres-
ent continuous, the present perfect, the present perfect continuous,
in addition to the "emphatic" (or negative and interrogative) form
with <u>do</u>. While the present continuous tense is the favored tense
for indicating on-going events in conversational English, it is a
well-known fact that a considerable number of verbs in English or-
dinarily d~ ot occur in this form in non-emphatic uses except in

secondary meanings.[3] The verb to be, moreover, does not occur in the present continuous if a permanent characterization is intended by the predicate adjective:

    a. 1. You are silly.
vs.   2. You are being silly.

The reader might be immediately reminded of the contrast, under similar circumstances, that can be made between ser and estar in Spanish. Hungarian, on the other hand, has no paradigmatic means of making such contrasts and has to achieve the same results by other means, including differing verb forms. The above sentences, then, may be rendered into Hungarian as follows:

    b. 1. Te ostoba vagy. ('are')
       2. Te ostobán viselkedsz. ('behave')

Since it is possible to indicate the temporary (and often amateurish) engagement in an activity by the frequentative morpheme -skod-, a.2 may also be rendered:

       3. Te ostobáskodsz.

A few of the English verbs listed in footnote 3 can be used in the present continuous only when used in secondary meanings, two different verbs being required to convey the same semantic import in Hungarian:

    c. 1. I see a man out there. (*am seeing)
       2. Látok egy embert odakint.

vs. d. 1. Steve is seeing a lot of Kate these days.
          (visits her often)
       2. Pista sokszor találkozik Katóval mostanában.
          ('meets')

and: e. 1. I'm seeing my doctor this afternoon.
       2. Ma délután az orvosomhoz megyek. ('going')

Thus, while some verbs in English can hardly occur in the continuous form and will accordingly present fewer problems for the student searching for equivalents in Hungarian, it goes without saying

that the student has to be especially alert in recognizing the idiomatic nature of some English verbs, as illustrated above, and seek out different lexical items as proper equivalents in Hungarian. A further illustration of this fact would be the verb _appear_ in contrast with the verb _resemble_, for example, which occurs only in the simple present form:

        f. 1. He _resembles_ his father.
           2. _Hasonlít_ az apjához.

but: g. 1. He _appears_ sick.
           2. Betegnek _látszik_. ('seems')

vs.   h. 1. He_'s appearing_ there today.
           2. Ott _szerepel_ ma. ('plays a role') (also: _lép fel_)

and so on. This whole phenomenon, of course, is another illustration of the truism that extensive one-to-one correspondences can hardly be expected between the "equivalent" forms of two different languages, even though these forms otherwise resemble each other in many respects.

17.1.1.2.1 _Hungarian simple present vs. other forms in English._ As mentioned above, the continuous tense in English is the favored tense to indicate an on-going event while the Hungarian form appears in the present. Several examples may suffice here to illustrate this common phenomenon:

        a. 1. The man_'s looking_ at me.
           2. Az ember engemet _néz_.

        b. 1. _Isn't_ the baby _sleeping_?
           2. A kisbaba nem _alszik_?

The currency of the on-going event may be marked in English by adverbs, of course, some of the most common being _now_, _today_, etc., and _always_, which is frequently used in hyperbole:

        c. 1. What _is_ she _doing_ now?
           2. Mit _csinál_ most?

275

d. 1. Where _is_ he _working_ today?
   2. Hol _dolgozik_ ma?

e. 1. He'_s_ always _complaining_.
   2. Mindig _panaszkodik_.

It is also a well-known fact that the simple present tense in Hungarian, and in many other languages of Europe, is used in situations where the equivalent in English requires the present perfect tense. Whenever the duration or extent of an on-going activity is indicated or questioned by a suitable time-adverbial, the present perfect is called for in English. It should be noted, however, that those verbs which ordinarily occur in the continuous form to designate unmarked on-going events do occur in the present perfect continuous also:

f. 1. How long _have_ you _been_ here? (*_are_)
   2. Mióta _vagy_ itt?

but: g. 1. How long _have_ you _been_ waiting for him? (*_wait_ or
           2. Mióta _vársz_ rá?   _are_ ...
                                                    waiting)

Much more will be said of the continuous tenses in the discussion of aspect below.

17.1.1.3 _Simple_ "_present_" _to_ _indicate_ _future_ _events_. The simple present tense in both English and Hungarian can be employed to designate events which are to take place in the future. This practice is especially common in both languages in instances where the time adverbial clearly marks the futurity of the action, as with _tomorrow, next week/month/year_, etc., and their Hungarian e-quivalents _holnap, jövő héten/hónapban/évben_, etc. This use of the present form is much more prevalent in Hungarian than it is in English since, as we have seen, there are other alternates to the simple present tense in the latter language which may also be used in this way, not to mention the fact that English has several

276

periphrastic futures which are commonly used. In my dialect the use of the present as a future is restricted to two principal uses: 1) optionally to indicate each of a series of future events, and 2) obligatorily to indicate a futurity after a future and a temporal conjunction. Several examples of 1) are:

    a. 1. I <u>leave</u> for Vienna tomorrow. (also: <u>am leaving</u>,
        2. Holnap <u>indulok</u> Bécsbe.   <u>I'll leave, am
                                             going to leave</u>,
                                             etc.)

    b. 1. First we <u>go</u> to Vienna, then to Rome.
        2. Először Bécsbe, utána Rómába megyünk.

In giving examples of the obligatory use of the future tense in English, we can at the same time indicate where the <u>present</u> tense cannot be used to indicate futurity in English, while the Hungarian equivalent may still be indicated by the use of the present. Thus, in the main clause in each of the following sentences, the unmarked futurity must be indicated by the periphrastic future in English, while in the dependent clause futurity is already marked and need not be represented in the verb form. The Hungarian equivalent sentences may have the present tense in both cases:

    c. 1. <u>I'll send</u> you a post card when I <u>arrive</u>. (*<u>send</u>;
        2. <u>Küldök</u> egy képeslapot, amint <u>megérkezek</u>.   *<u>(wi)ll
                                                   arrive</u>)

    d. 1. I <u>won't leave</u> the house until she <u>phones</u>. (*<u>don't
        2. Addig nem <u>hagyom</u> el a házat, amíg fel   leave</u>;
           nem hív telefonon.   *<u>will
                                                   phone</u>)

The two Hungarian sentences immediately above illustrate at least two other features of Hungarian grammar which may be profitably discussed at this point, namely, 1) Hungarian does have a periphrastic future, like English, which may be used instead of the present tense, as in c.2, for example, and 2) Hungarian may view the <u>continuity</u> of an on-going event while the parallel situation

in English is considered from the point of view of the future ter-mination of the event. In discussing point 1) it should be men-tioned that the Hungarian periphrastic future may be manipulated to indicate varying degrees of certainty of the fulfillment of the future event. Thus, c.2 can have at least the following variants, the second being more emphatic:

    e. 1. <u>Küldeni fogok</u> egy képeslapot, amint megérkezek.
       2. I'<u>ll send</u> you a post card when I arrive.

    f. 1. <u>Fogok küldeni</u> egy képeslapot, amint megérkezek.
       2. I <u>will send</u> you a post card when I arrive.
         (or <u>promise to</u>)

Emphasis on the auxiliary, in f.2, for example, may achieve the same effect in English that is achieved by inversion in Hungarian. Point 2) as discussed above manifests itself most notably in the negation of the second verb. This means that the activity desig-nated by the first-mentioned verb continues during the time that the activity designated by the second verb has <u>not</u> been completed. Thus d.2, which happens to have a negative in the main clause also, may be paraphrased: 'My act of leaving the house will not take place during the time that her phone call has not been placed.' However, this characteristic feature of Hungarian grammar is not irrevocably rooted in the grammatical system, as is evidenced by the fact that the negative is optional in many instances. Several examples of this tendency may suffice:

    g. 1. Addig nem tudok választ adni, amíg(<u>nem</u>) beszélem
         meg a dolgot a feleségemmel.
       2. I can't give you an answer until I discuss the mat-ter-with my wife.

    h. 1. Pista addig gyalogolt, amíg egy kunyhóra (<u>nem</u>)
         talált.
       2. Steve walked until he found a hut.

As evidenced by the last example, the to-be-completed action could actually be completed with respect to a later speech event, but

viewed from the time of the first event, it was still to be ful-
filled.

17.1.2 <u>Simple past tense</u>. Just as we have seen one simple
form in Hungarian corresponding to several present-tense forms in
English, so also can we find just one past form in Hungarian cor-
responding to various past-tense possibilities in English. There
are many points of agreement in the uses of the respective simple
past tenses of Hungarian and English, but obviously many points of
contrast as well, which we will attempt to bring out in detail here.
One point of agreement is found in the indication of events consid-
ered past with respect to the time of the speech event and not to
other events in the discourse itself. Thus we have:

    a. 1. I <u>went</u> to the movies last night.
       2. Tegnap este moziba <u>mentem</u>.

    b. 1. Where <u>were</u> you last night?
       2. Hol <u>voltál</u> tegnap este?

Interrogation of other past-tense verbs in English, of course, re-
quires the use of the past tense of the interrogative auxiliary <u>do</u>
with the inversion of subject and auxiliary, while the correspond-
ing Hungarian simple verbs require neither an interrogative auxili-
ary nor inversion. We have already had numerous examples of this
simple fact scattered throughout this study, and consequently need
but one illustration here:

    c. 1. Where <u>did</u> you go?
       2. Hova <u>mentél</u>?

Needless to say, the above is only one area in which the simple
past in Hungarian requires a composite form in English, some of
which we will now proceed to discuss.

279

17.1.2.1 <u>Simple past in Hungarian vs. present perfect in</u>
<u>English</u>. The present perfect tense needs special discussion here
for it not only designates on-going events begun in the past, re-
quiring, as we have seen, the Hungarian present tense for proper
translation, but also past events, the effects of which are still
felt in the discourse situation. These latter instances naturally
require the verb to be in the simple past in Hungarian sentences of
the same semantic import. The immediacy of the effect of the e-
vents designated by the verbs in the present perfect in English is
often strengthened by the employment of such adverbs as <u>yet</u>, <u>al-</u>
<u>ready</u>, <u>just</u>, etc., but these need not be present for the verb form
to achieve its proper effect:

      a. 1. I'<u>ve</u> <u>seen</u> that <u>film</u> already.
         2. Azt a filmet már <u>láttam</u>.

      b. 1. John <u>hasn't</u> <u>come</u> yet.
         2. János még-nem <u>jött</u> meg.

The important feature of the use of the present perfect tense in
English is the fact that the effects of the event indicated by the
given verb are still being felt, or that if the action of the verb
has not yet been fulfilled, it is still capable of being fulfilled.
This convention may be illustrated by contrasts in tense form in
English, the Hungarian equivalent often employing the adverb <u>már</u>
to indicate the open-endedness of the situation in regard to final
fulfillment:

      c. 1. <u>Have</u> you <u>seen</u> the Picassc exhibit? (It's still on.)
         2. <u>Láttad</u> <u>már</u> a Picasso-kiállítást?

vs.   d. 1. <u>Did</u> you <u>see</u> the Picasso exhibit? (It's over.)
         2. <u>Láttad</u> a Picasso-kiállítást?

This contrast is especially striking in the negative, where the
present perfect may even have a time limit placed on the possibi-
lity of fulfillment of the action stated by the verb. In this case

the adverbial még nem 'not yet' is used in Hungarian to convey the idea of open-endedness in the equivalent sentence:

    e. 1. I haven't shaved this morning.
        (said before noon; "I still may.")
      2. I didn't shave this morning.
        (said after noon, or if before, then with meaning:
        "I don't intend to.")

The adverb yet may be used to reinforce the idea that the non-fulfilled action may still be completed, thereby paralleling the Hungarian még nem, but its use is optional:

    f. 1. I haven't shaved (yet) today.
      2. Ma még nem borotválkoztam.

Many subtleties of meaning can be achieved by the use of the present perfect (as opposed to the simple past in English) to the effect that the results of the completed action are still valid. In some instances it is difficult to separate this effect from the mere fact of open-endedness, since past events may be repeated even while their effects are still being felt. It may prove useful to give further examples here, showing by paraphrase the semantic effect of the present perfect:

    g. 1. I've read David Copperfield. (Therefore I know the
                                    work.)
vs.   2. I read David Copperfield. (I'm reporting a sim-
                                    ple fact.)

    h. 1. I've read this book five times.
        -(Either: I know the work, or I may read it
        again.)
vs.   2. I read this book five times. (fact)

While the Hungarian equivalent sentences must use different means of expressing the contrast achieved in English by the use of the present perfect versus the simple past to indicate the possibility of completed action, Hungarian does seem to have a similar contrast in the use of the simple past vs. the simple present in instances where the duration of an activity (or the non-fulfillment of the

activity) is indicated:

      i. 1. We <u>haven't</u> <u>seen</u> Mary for several months.
         2. Máriát több hónapja nem <u>láttuk</u>. (past; possibili-
                                    ties closed)
         3. Máriát több hónapja nem <u>látjuk</u>. (pres.; possibili-
                                    ties open)

A further interlingual contrast along these lines is found in the
use of the simple past in Hungarian with the placement of the ad-
verb in various positions in the sentence to denote expectation of
the fulfillment in one instance and surprise in the other, an ef-
fect .chieved in English by the use of two different adverbs:

      j. 1. A gyerekek elmentek <u>már</u> iskolába?
         2. Have the children gone to school <u>yet</u>?

      k. 1. <u>Már</u> elmentek a gyerekek iskolába?
         2. <u>Have</u> the children gone to school <u>already</u>?

It might be pointed out at this juncture that Hungarian often does
not make a clear-cut distinction between the <u>duration</u> of an event
and the <u>point</u> <u>of</u> <u>time</u> at which the event took place or terminated.
Thus, one and the same time adverbial may be used in reference to
these differing aspects of time. In the case of the present tense
(present perfect in English) such adverbials indicate the duration
of the on-going activity; with the past tense, on the other hand,
the identical adverbs indicate a point in time:

      l. 1. Két éve, hogy itt van.
         2. He has been here for two years.

      m. 1. Két éve, hogy itt volt.
         2. He was here two years ago. (*has been)

Ambiguities are possible with the use of <u>óra</u> 'hour,' which is homo-
phonous with <u>óra</u> 'o'clock,' when the suffix -<u>ig</u> is used since it is
used equally for indicating duration and point of time:

      n. 1. Két óráig dolgozott.
         2. He worked for two hours.
or: 3. He worked until two o'clock.

In neither case can the English present perfect be used here since

it would indicate that the event is on-going when used in conjunction with an adverb of duration, or is repeated when used with such adverbials as <u>until</u> phrases. Other adverbs indicating more or less definite points in past time are completely incompatible with the present perfect, as can be illustrated in the following examples:

    o. 1. *I have gone to the movies yesterday.
       2. *She has met him two years ago.

Teachers of English to speakers of other languages might recognize these as being typical of mistakes made as a result of the interference with the use of the present perfect in German in such instances. This does bring up a point of contrast between English and Hungarian word order when both a time adverbial and a place adverbial are present in the same sentence. Hungarian agrees with the German practice in placing the time adverbial before place designations. English, of course, has the reverse order:

    p. 1. Már tíz hónapja távol van.
       2. He has been away ten months now.   (*ten months
                                       away)

    q. 1. Tíz éve lakik Budapesten.
       2. He has lived in Budapest (for) ten years.

This order holds in Hungarian even when the adverbs are not contiguous, although, naturally, any syntactic element may be taken out of its normal order and placed elsewhere in the sentence for the sake of emphasis. This holds especially for time adverbials in English, but almost any element in Hungarian, as we have seen in Chapter XIII.

17.2 <u>Composite tense forms</u>

Although we have occasionally spoken of composite tense forms in the first section of this chapter as possible or necessary equivalents of Hungarian simple tenses, it is necessary to discuss the

multiple-forms here because we have not fully exploited the full range of "meanings" possible with the numerous compound verbs of English. In addition to this, Hungarian has several composite forms of its own which are worthy of discussion here. We shall begin with the forms which show the greatest amount of similarity between the two languages, namely the periphrastic futures.

17.2.1 The periphrastic futures in English and Hungarian. We have seen that while both English and Hungarian can, to varying degrees, use the simple present tenses to indicate future action, in addition, however, both languages have recourse to a composite form to indicate future events with varying amounts of certainty as to fulfillment. As indicated in 17.1.2, the composite future in Hungarian may be used to indicate certain action by the prepositioning of the verb with the auxiliary in very first position. Although traditional grammars place great emphasis on the fact that the English future auxiliary will was originally a full verb signifying an act of volition, there seems to me to be very little left of strong determination in the auxiliary will, which, unless stressed, is contracted to 'll in most cases. Moreover, even the stressed form of the future may be replaced by other verbs, or verb-adverb combinations, to indicate varying degrees of determination regarding the future action. Thus, starting with "neutral" indications of future action, a form of fog serving as the future auxiliary in Hungarian, we have:

a. 1. (Majd) meg fogom tenni.
   2. I'll do it (later).

b. 1. Mennyi ideig fog tartani a munka?
   2. How long will the work last?

Stressing the immediacy of the future action, we may also have, for example:

    c. 1. We are (just) about to leave.
       2. Mi éppen indulóban/indulófélben vagyunk.

or: d. 1. We are ready to leave.
       2. Éppen indulásra készen vagyunk.

vs: e. 1. We'll leave.
       2. Indulni fogunk.

Using the present continuous tense in English instead of the future
also lends immediacy to the action, while the corresponding Hungar-
ian sentence generally employs the present tense to achieve the
same effect, the future not being excluded, however:

    f. 1. She's flying to Vienna tomorrow.
       2. Holnap Bécsbe repül. (fog repülni)

    g. 1. He's getting married soon.
       2. Rövidesen megnősül.

    h. 1. I'm going on vacation in July.
       2. Júliusban szabadságra megyek.

Another extremely common verbal combination for expressing more or
less certainty with respect to future actions in English is going
to, which in some varieties of American English has virtually oust-
ed will as the current sign of the future:

    i. 1. She's going to fly to Vienna tomorrow.
       2. I'm going to go on vacation in July.

all of which would have the same Hungarian equivalents as already
indicated. Certainty, coupled with varying degrees of moral or
social obligation, may also be expressed in English by the use of
is to in place of will. The Hungarian equivalents will vary ac-
cording to the amount of obligation intended to be conveyed:

    j. 1. She is to fly to Vienna tomorrow.
       2. Tervek szerint holnap Bécsbe repül. ('according to
                                                    plans')

If the certainty expressed by is to is quite strong, then, of
course, other lexical items may be substituted for the auxiliary:

or:
k. 1. He _is to_ stay for three weeks.
2. He _intends to_ stay for three weeks.
3. Három hétig _szándékozik_ maradni.   .

It goes without saying that almost any number of adverbs may be
used to indicate various degrees of certainty of future action,
ranging from _probably_ 'valoszinüleg' to _absolutely_ 'feltétlenul'
and covering everything in between. However, this is more a matter
of semantics than syntax and cannot be pursued further here. One
morpho-syntactic item that ought to be mentioned at this point,
however, is the fact that Hungarian has a special future form of
the verb _van_ 'is,' namely _lesz_.[4] Several examples may be given
here:

l. 1. Ötven éves _leszek_ a következő' születésnapomon.
2. I'_ll be_ fifty on my next birthday.

m. 1. Holnap vasárnap _lesz_.
2. Tomorrow will be Sunday.

17.2.1.1 _The periphrastic future as a polite request in Eng-
lish_. Up to this point in our study we have assumed that _will_ is
the only viable auxiliary used in the periphrastic future in Ameri-
can English. This means we can ignore _shall_ here for all practical
purposes, except for one widespread use, namely in interrogative
sentences with a first-person subject. Upon inspection of several
examples of this usage, one must, in fact, conclude that _shall_ is
actually no longer a future auxiliary, but rather a "polite inter-
rogative" and, as such, should not be translated by the future in
Hungarian, as is sometimes done in textbooks of English. (See,
for example, Tarján and Korenchy 1965:62.) In a typical English
sentence such as a.1 below, for example, an opinion is requested,
while in a.2 a factual yes-no answer is sought in regard to the
future action:

2&6

```
                a. 1. Shall we work on Sunday?
vs.                2. Are we going to work on Sunday?
```

Hungarian equivalents of the polite requests marked by _shall_ are

best rendered by the appropriate verb in the imperative, as in the

following examples:

```
                b. 1. Where shall we go? .
                   2. Hova menjunk?

                c. 1. Shall I open the window?
                   2. Kinyissam az ablakot?
```

That these are polite requests rather than questions relating to

futurity is clearly evidenced by the variety of formulas used as

a substitute for _shall_ by speakers who feel this form is too form-

al. Some of these are:

```
                d. 1. Do you mind if I close the window?
                   2. Is it all right if I close the window?
or:                3. Do you want me to close the window?
or even:           4. How about if I close the window?
```

all of which may be rendered by the verbs in the imperative in Hun-

garian or the polite _szabad?_ 'may I?', e.g., "Szabad becsuknom?"

'May I close it?' However, discussing such formulas further here,

as important as they are in a complete grammar of either language

under study, leads too far out of the realm of syntax.

17.2.2 _Other composite verb forms in Hungarian._ In the prev-

ious sections of this chapter we have seen that Hungarian, like

English, has only two "simple" tenses, namely, the present and the

past, and one composite form, the periphrastic future, a "syntactic

construction" rather than a tense, according to Antal (1966).

Whether one cares to label the conditional and the imperative as

"tenses" (Antal 1966) or as "moods" (Lotz 1962), one is still con-

fronted with a residue of composite verbal forms in Hungarian which

are worthy of brief consideration here. One of these composite

forms, namely the conditional perfect, is of paradigmatic significance since it is the regular past-time counterpart of the simple conditional. The other verbal combination, _szoktam_ + infinitive, is anomalous on several counts.[5]

17.2.2.1 _The conditional perfect_. As a composite tense, the Hungarian conditional perfect shows several points of contrast with the corresponding form in English. In the first place, the lexical verb is inflected for person while in English it is the auxiliary (or the first verb in a compound auxiliary) which shows the inflection, if, indeed, there is any inflection at all. The auxiliary precedes the main verb in English, while it generally follows in Hungarian. Just as the present conditional in Hungarian is used in both the "contrary-to-fact" conditional clause and the main clause, so also is the perfect conditional used in both clauses. The English equivalents generally require the "subjunctive" and the "conditional," respectively, although, of course, there often is little formal justification for such labelling. Here the translations will serve to indicate what the possible English correspondences might be. Thus, if in a present-time situation a sentence such as a.1 is uttered, then the corresponding past-time utterance would appear as b.1, the English equivalents being as given:

    a. 1. Ha ott _lennék_, _megmondanám_ neki.
       2. If I _were_ there, I _would_ _tell_ him.

    b. 1. Ha ott _lettem volna_, _megmondtam volna_ neki.
       2. If I _had_ _been_ there, I would _have_ _told_ him.

While the present conditional occurs quite often in optative constructions and polite formulas in Hungarian, the perfect conditional has a more restricted range of uses. Although the latter may indeed be used to express wishes relating to unfulfilled events, it

is quite anomalous in constructions meant to be softened requests
parallel to the frequent constructions with the present condition-
al. In fact, the overwhelming uses of the perfect conditional do
involve an indication of some unfulfilled action, either in opta-
tive or declarative form. Several additional examples may suffice
to illustrate this tendency:

      c. 1. Bárcsak <u>eljöttél</u> <u>volna</u> te is!
         2. If only you <u>had</u> <u>come</u> <u>along</u> too!

      d. 1. Mi <u>lett</u> <u>volna</u>, ha nem <u>láttalak</u> <u>volna</u>
         2. What <u>would</u> <u>have</u> <u>happened</u> if I <u>had</u> not <u>seen</u> you

The English sentences b.2 and d.2 show a simplifying tendency which
is reminiscent of the reduction shown by the periphrastic future
in <u>if</u> (or <u>when</u>) clauses, namely, like the future, the conditional
perfect in English need not be marked in an <u>if</u> clause since the
main clause has a marked conditional perfect. This tendency car-
ries over to optative clauses also, where, of course, the main
clause is "deleted." The Hungarian counterparts of the two English
sentences just mentioned also show an item of intralingual contrast
which should be called to the student's attention. This is the
fact that the verb <u>van</u> 'is' has its perfect conditional built on
the stem <u>le-</u>, and not <u>vol-</u> as is its preterite, all other verbs,
of course, forming the perfect conditional from the simple past
form (definite or indefinite). Thus, the expected form <u>voltam</u>
<u>volna</u> is obsolete.

    17.2.2.2 <u>The</u> <u>szoktam</u> + <u>infinitive</u> <u>construction</u>. There is an
anomaly in both the present-time and past-time uses of the <u>szoktam</u>
construction in Hungarian. To begin with, this verb itself is
morphologically a <u>past</u> <u>tense</u> form, but when used with the infini-
tive alone, it indicates a customary or regularly repeated action.

The English equivalent of this syntactic construction is often the simple present-tense form, with or without such adverbs as <u>usually</u>, <u>generally</u>, etc. :

    a. 1. Szabad időmben <u>sétálni</u> szoktam.
        2. In my free time I usually <u>take</u> a walk.

    b. 1. Nem <u>szoktunk elkésni.</u>
        2. We usually <u>don't come</u> late.

    c. 1. Nem szoktam cigarettázni.
        2. I don't smoke.

In each instance here, the English-speaking student might be tempted to see a close parallel between the <u>szoktam</u> construction and the English <u>used to</u>. However, as indicated above, the time references do not agree, <u>szoktam</u> being used for present-time situations in spite of its past-tense form. To indicate customary action in the past Hungarian often displays another type of anomaly, namely the use of the "remote past" (Hungarian <u>régmúlt</u>) of the auxiliary <u>szoktam</u>, a tense otherwise obsolete in modern standard Hungarian. This composite form, consisting of the past tense of both the above auxiliary and the pluperfect auxiliary <u>van</u>, is quite rare, and according to my informant, occurs most acceptably in final position in a sentence showing comparison. In such instances <u>used to</u> is a good equivalent in English:

    d. 1. Már nem todok olyan gyorsan futni, mint ahogyan
           <u>szoktam volt.</u>
        2. I <u>can't run as</u> fast as I <u>used to.</u>

This type of indication of repeated or customary action leads us to a more detailed consideration of aspect, which now follows.

1. See Bull 1960 for an extensive discussion of this matter.

2. Hall 1959 gives numerous illustrations of how different cultures view time "informally" or personally, and what the non-linguistic consequences of such views are.

3. The following list of verbs which generally do not occur in the continuous tense, though not complete, may be of interest: see, hear, notice, recognize, smell (intr.), taste (intr.), remember, forget, know, understand, recall, recollect, believe, (also feel, think), suppose, mean, gather ("understand"), want, wish, desire, refuse, forgive, care, love, hate, like, be fond of, be angry, etc., adore, seem, signify, appear ("seem"), belong to, matter, possess (also have), consist of, own, and others. (See Tarjan and Korenchy 1965:35.)

4. In generative terms, the (obligatory) change of van + lenni to lesz is a transformation on the same order as the one which requires that nem + van be changed to nincs and the one changing is + nem to sem or is (or se) + nincs to sincs.

5. The verb szokni may be conjugated for all persons, of course, but for the sake of simplicity here I am using the first person singular form as a symbol for all forms.

291

CHAPTER XVIII

ASPECT

18.0 Introduction

We have already mentioned, if only briefly, several devices used in Hungarian to mark various aspects. In the case of phrasal verbs, for example, we have shown that 1) the addition of a prefix often shows perfective aspect while the simplex verb shows imperfectiveness, e.g. megenni 'to eat up' vs. enni, 'to eat' 2) postposition of the prefix often indicates imperfectiveness vs. the perfectiveness of the preposed position: Hazament, 'He went home.' vs. Ment haza, 'He was on the way home.' and 3) reduplication of the prefix indicates the frequentative aspect: Vissza-visszatekintett, 'He kept glancing back.' We have also indicated that there is a productive suffix employed to give frequentative meaning to verbs or to form frequentative verbs out of nouns or adjectives. The example given above was ostobáskodik 'he's acting silly' from ostoba 'stupid, silly.' The truth of the matter is that there are numerous, more or less productive suffixes in Hungarian which may be used to give aspectual nuances to some verbs. These formative suffixes will be considered to be lexical items here which can be gotten from one of the more complete grammars of Hungarian.[1] What is of more immediate concern for a contrastive analysis such as this are the syntactic devices used in English and Hungarian for indicating the state of completion of an action or the relative time of one event compared to another. These are not readily convertible to lists in dictionaries or glossaries. As is well known, the favored device in English for indicating imperfect aspect is the use of the continuous (or "progressive") tenses, while Hungarian

uses various time-adverbials to make the same sort of differentiation. We have already seen numerous examples of these given without much elaboration. Now follows the necessary elaboration.

18.1 The continuous tenses in English

The English tenses we will be dealing with in this section can be illustrated as follows: is writing, was writing, has been writing, had been writing, will be writing, and will have been writing. These will be referred to as the present continuous, past continuous, etc. We have already discussed the first of these briefly in our treatment of the present tense and the periphrastic future in Hungarian and have indicated that the present continuous in English generally requires a present-tense form in Hungarian unless reference is made to a future event, in which case the periphrastic future is occasionally used in the Hungarian equivalent. We have also indicated that the continuous tense in English shows an intralingual contrast with the simple present tense since the latter may denote a permanent characteristic, while the former shows a transitory state: are being silly vs. are silly, for example. It is our intention at this point to further relate the continuous tenses to matters of relative time and, primarily by translation, to indicate what devices may be used to convey the same sort of distinctions in Hungarian, when such distinctions are felt to be necessary.

18.1.1 Present-time relations as expressed by the continuous tenses. The most characteristic feature of the continuous tenses is their dependent, that is to say, their context-bound nature. They characteristically relate the time of an on-going activity to some other time, either explicitly expressed in the discourse, or

-284- 293

implicit in the discourse situation. This means, among other things, that the past continuous cannot acceptably be the only tense form in a sentence intended as the sole utterance in a discourse, while the simple past tense can serve this function. Thus a.1 below seems deficient as a discourse; there seems to be more information needed. After hearing a.1, one is inclined to ask, "Well, what happened?" while a.2 is complete as it stands:

vs.
    a. 1. I was writing a letter to my aunt yesterday.
       2. I wrote a letter to my aunt yesterday.

Unless otherwise marked, the present continuous tense relates to a non-habitual or non-characteristic, on-going event with an implied time-limit, in contrast to the repetition or open-endedness of an action expressed in the simple present tense. It is in this way that we can contrast is being silly (now) with is (always/usually/generally) silly. Further examples are given in the following sentences, the translations of which indicate that differing verbs can be used in Hungarian to achieve the same sort of contras shown by the different verb forms in English:

    b. 1. He's living in Paris. (temporarily, or at least
       2. Párizsban él.   now as opposed to the past

vs.
    c. 1. He lives in Paris. (permanent home, no time limit
       2. Párizsban lakik.

The time relationship implicit in the present continuous tense may, of course, be reinforced by the use of such adverbs as now or nowadays, etc., and the time-limit may likewise be stated: "He's living in Paris for the time being." Thus, b.1 implies prior knowledge of the subject's former residence, while c.1 does not. Likewise d.1 below would generally be asked if the interlocutor has some prior knowledge relating to the addressee's former occupation otherwise e.1 would more likely be the question:

d. 1. What <u>are</u> you <u>doing</u> for a living? (i.e., "these days")
   2. Mi a <u>jelenlegi</u> foglalkozásod? ('<u>present</u> occupation')

e. 1. What <u>do</u> you <u>do</u> for a living?
   2. Mi a <u>foglalkozásod</u>?

In fact, unless said to a fairly close friend, a question such as d.1 could be impolite, while its Hungarian translation shows another common means of indicating the same time relationship inherent in the English present continuous tense. As indicated previously, another common way of indicating various temporal relationships in Hungarian, where tense differentiations are lacking, is through the use of various adverbials, including identical nouns with contrasting relational suffixes:

f. 1. He'<u>s living with</u> his uncle.
   2. A nagybátyjá<u>nál</u> lakik.   (cf. German <u>bei</u>)

g. 1. He <u>lives with</u> his uncle.
   2. A nagybátyjá<u>val</u> lakik.   (cf. German <u>mit</u>)

Inquiring about the duration of such an activity as indicated by the continuous tense in the English examples immediately above requires that the verbs be put in corresponding perfect forms while the present tense still holds for the Hungarian:

h. 1. How long <u>has</u> he <u>been living</u> with his uncle?
   2. Mióta <u>lakik</u> a nagybátyjánál?

i. 1. How long <u>has</u> he <u>lived</u> with his uncle?
   2. Mióta <u>lakik</u> a nagybátyjával?

although, of course, declarative sentences can also be found in which the perfect tenses are contrasted as to the continuous vs. the non-continuous nature of the activity they denote. Employing, of course, a verb which ordinarily may occur in the continuous tense, we can have, for example:

```
        j. 1. I've been writing letters
vs.              all afternoon.          (and still am.)
              2. I've written six letters
and              this afternoon.          (and may write more.)
              3. I wrote six letters this
                 afternoon.              (I'm finished.)
```

Since have been writing denotes an on-going activity, the present

tense is used in the equivalent in Hungarian, while the remaining

two examples contain verbs which depict past-time activities, and

call for past-tense equivalents in Hungarian, the adverb már being

employed to indicate the open-endedness of the activity as marked

by the form of the verb in j.2: "Már hat levelet írtam ma délu-

tán."

18.1.2 Past-time relations as expressed by continuous tenses.

The past continuous tense in English has often been compared to

the imperfect tenses of the Romance languages. It provides the

"background" for another action, that is, it indicates an activity

in progress at the time another activity is fulfilled. Since both

activities are depicted as having been completed, the Hungarian e-

quivalents generally call for the simple present tense with adverb-

ials supplying the necessary distinctions in time. It can be seen

that the use of the past continuous tense does not require that

the accompanying past action be overtly present in the same utter-

ance. The proper time relationship may be indicated by the use of

a temporal adverbial, or just may be gotten from the discourse sit-

uation itself. The following sentences, for example, imply a prio:

context for the proper identification of such definite nominals as

he, and the table, in addition to the "definite time adverbial"

at that time:

        a. 1. He was travelling in Italy at that time.
           2. Abban az időben (éppen) Olaszországban utazott.

-287- 296

b. 1. An Italian was sitting on the other side of the
                      table.
                   2. Az asztal másik felén egy olasz ült.

More often than not, however, the past continuous form is accom-
panied by the simple past-tense form of the other verb used in
correlation with it:

                c. 1. We were eating when our friend stepped in.
                   2. Éppen ebédeltünk, amikor a barátunk belépett.

                d. 1. I was studying when the telephone rang.
                   2. Éppen tanultam, amikor a telefon csengett.

As shown in the examples, the Hungarian past tense forms are often
reinforced by the adverb éppen, a close equivalent of the English
just, which is used to indicate nearness of a past-time event.
Coterminous events may also be indicated by the use of the past
continuous tense for all verbs involved, the imperfectiveness of
both actions being placed in the foreground:

                e. 1. While I was studying, Steve was writing letters.
                   2. Miallat tanultam, Pista leveleket írt.

These verb forms, of course, still require contextual indications
of the relative times of their fulfillment. Stressing the dura-
tion of the "background" activity in English calls for the use of
the perfect tense, in this case the past perfect continuous. The
Hungarian equivalent as usual expresses the on-going nature of the
imperfective activity by the time adverbial in -ja and the time
relationship by the almost ubiquitous már, the verb being in the
simple past:

                f. 1. I had been working for five hours when he came.
                   2. Már öt órája dolgoztam, amikor megjött.

Questioning the extent of time already involved in the on-going
activity can be in the form of a yes-no question or interrogative-
word construction, in which case either one or the other of the
familiar adverbial elements in the Hungarian are replaced:

g. 1. How long <u>had</u> you <u>been</u> <u>living</u> in Paris when you
      first met her?
   2. Mennyi ideje <u>laktál</u> Párizsban, amikor előszőr
      találkoztál vele?

h. 1. <u>Had</u> you <u>been</u> <u>waiting</u> for him for long when he
      arrived?
   2. Régóta <u>vártál</u> már rá, amikor megérkezett?

Needless to say, the fact that some verbs in English tend to be
incompatible with a continuous-tense form holds also for the per-
fect continuous tenses. Compare i.1 with f.1:

i. 1. I <u>had</u> <u>been</u> ill six days when he   (*<u>had</u> <u>been</u> <u>being</u>)
      arrived.
   2. Már hat napja beteg <u>voltam</u>, amikor megérkezett.

Removing the imperfective element from the verb designating the
activity more remote in time naturally involves change from the
continuous to the past perfect tense for even those verbs which
can and usually do occur in the former form. This may occur with
or without the employment of <u>already</u> to reinforce the notion of
completeness, while the Hungarian equivalent may use the accusa-
tive instead of the -<u>ja</u> suffix on the time element:

j. 1. I <u>had</u> (already) <u>worked</u> five hours before he
      arrived.
   2. Már öt órát ledolgoztam, mielőtt megérkezett.

With the use of temporal conjunctions as <u>before</u> and <u>after</u> the time
relationships otherwise expressed by the use of the past perfect
tenses are often considered redundant. Accordingly one can find
the simple past used in place of the past perfect in English,
thereby making a very close parallel with the use of the Hungarian
simple past. Sentence j.1 then could have <u>worked</u> instead of <u>had</u>
<u>worked</u>, the Hungarian equivalent remaining the same. Another ex-
ample of this tendency is the following:

         k. 1. After I <u>had</u> <u>read</u> the book, I went for a walk.
or   2. After I <u>read</u> the book, I went for a walk.
            3. Miután <u>elolvastam</u> a könyvet, elmentem sétálni.

18.1.3 _The continuous tenses to express future time._ In the
preceding chapter we gave several examples of the use of the pres-
ent continuous tense to express future action, and that a very
common form used to express immediate futurity is the continuous
tense of _go_ employed as an auxiliary. Thus, we may have:

> a. 1. I'm leaving for Vienna tomorrow.
> or   2. I'm going to leave for Vienna tomorrow.

both of which have the simple present tense in their Hungarian e-
quivalents. However, to stress the continuousness of the activity,
either of the activity itself or in relation to another non-dura-
tive activity, speakers have recourse to the future continuous
tenses in English. The Hungarian translations show either the
present or the periphrastic future with apparently a preference
for the simple present:

> b. 1. Tomorrow at this time we'll _be nearing_ France.
>   2. Holnap ilyenkor már Franciaország felé közeledünk.
>
> c. 1. I'll (still) _be working_ when you get back.
>   2. En még mindig _dolgozni fogok,_ amikor hazajössz.

The second clause in c.2 above illustrates once again a feature of
the use of the composite future in English, namely that after _if-_ or
_when-_clauses the present form is used instead of the future. This
holds for the future continuous also. The following example shows
a reduction of the future continuous after _if_ and a reduction of
the periphrastic future after _when,_ while the future is retained
in the main clause. It can be noted that the equivalents in Hun-
garian may all be in the present tense:

> d. 1. If you _are_ still _working_ when I _come_ back, I'll
>   _write_ some letters.
>   2. Ha még mindig _dolgozol,_ amikor majd _hazajövök,_
>   _megírok_ néhány levelet.

The same time relationships that we have discussed in regard to
the use of the perfect tenses in the present and past in English

are applicable for the future also. The activity denoted by the future continuous verb in c.1 above, for example, may be viewed in its extension or duration, in which case the future perfect continuous is used, while the Hungarian counterpart occurs in the present with the time adverbial in -ja:

> e. 1. I <u>will</u> <u>have</u> <u>been</u> <u>working</u> five hours when you get back.
> 2. Már öt órája <u>dolgozom</u>, amikor visszajössz.
>
> f. 1. At six o'clock tomorrow morning I <u>will</u> <u>have</u> <u>been</u> <u>sleeping</u> for seven hours.
> 2. Holnap reggel hat órakor lesz, hogy hét órája <u>alszom</u>.

Describing an activity which is less durative than working or sleeping may require the non-continuous future perfect, the Hungarian translation still showing the use of the present tense:

> g. 1. Next year at this time George <u>will</u> <u>have</u> <u>gotten</u> his degree.
> 2. Már jövő ilyenkorra Györgynek <u>meglesz</u> a diplomája.

18.2 Sequence of tenses

As indicated in the previous section, the matter of aspect in English is almost inextricably interwoven with considerations of time, particularly time relative to the time of another event in the discourse. It might be profitable to summarize at this point what we have indicated to be important from the standpoint of the English tenses, even though from a contrastive point of view the paucity of tense forms in Hungarian may make interference problems less troublesome for English-speaking students, who have only a present or past tense to choose from.

18.2.1 <u>Time indications of English tenses</u>. Both English and Hungarian may view an activity from either of two time references, namely the actual time of the speech act, or the time of an event

mentioned in the discourse. It is abundantly clear that, general-
ly speaking, English makes many more time distinctions by means of
tense-form alone and that Hungarian often can make the same sorts
of distinctions through a wide variety of adverbials, whenever
this is felt to be necessary. It goes without saying, moreover,
that even though the two languages do employ the same two time
references, broadly speaking, there is not always complete agree-
ment between the two languages as to whether a given situation
should be viewed from the point of view of one time or the other.
This will be illustrated further below after we have reviewed the
sequence of tenses. If we view events, first of all, considered
from the time of the speech act itself, we get several interlin-
gual contrasts in addition to quite a few instances of correspond-
ence. Viewing the time of one event in relation to the time of
another event shows still other contrasts. Thus, in the first cat-
egory we have at least the following possibilities:

Activities viewed from the time of the speech act

Description	English	Hungarian
"timeless" events	present	present
habitually repeated events	present (interrogative, neg- ative or emphatic forms with do)	present (or szoktam)
begun in past, open- ended	present perfect	present
same with emphasis on on-going nature of activity	present perfect continuous	present
on-going without refer- ence to inception	present continuous	present
dramatic narration of completed events	present or past	present or past
completed event, effect still immediate	present perfect	present

Description	English	Hungarian
narration of completed events	past	past
repeated or habitual past events	past (<u>used</u> <u>to</u>/would)	past (<u>szoktam</u> <u>volt</u>)
future events, either immediate or with time stated	present, present continuous,(<u>going</u> <u>to</u>)	present
future events less immediate than above	future, (<u>going</u> <u>to</u>)	future or present

Activities viewed in relation to another activity

Description	English	Hungarian
past event on-going in relation to another event	past continuous	past
past event anterior to another completed event	past perfect	past
past event begun before subsequent event, duration stressed	past perfect continuous	past
future event, durative with respect to other event	future continuous	present or future
future event, completed with respect to other event	future perfect	present
future event, initiated prior to other event, duration stressed	future perfect continuous	present

Setting aside the levelling of tenses that we have noticed occurring in time clauses in English, as well as the anomalies of tense in indirect speech to be discussed below, we might have the following partial paradigm if we were to select a verb compatible with the continuous aspect:

Tense label	English	Hungarian
present	works	dolgozik
present continuous	is working	dolgozik
present perfect continuous	has been working	dolgozik

Tense label	English	Hungarian
past	worked	dolgozott
present perfect	has worked	dolgozott
past continuous	was working	dolgozott
past perfect	had worked	dolgozott
past perfect continuous	had been working	dolgozott
future	will work (is going to work or works)	dolgozni fog (dolgozik)
future continuous	will be working	dolgozni fog (dolgozik)
future perfect	will have worked	dolgozott (dolgozik)
future perfect continuous	will have been working	dolgozott (dolgozik)

In addition to the list of mismatches in tense given above, one has
to bear in mind that the dramatic present ("historical present") is
used much more often in Hungarian than in English, and that the
present tense in Hungarian often serves to indicate future time as
expressed by the periphrastic future in English. Moreover, the
sequence of tenses followed in indirect speech deviates from even
the elementary scheme outlined above, and as a consequence deserves
further discussion here.

18.2.2 Sequence of tenses in indirect speech. We have al-
ready indicated in 17.1.1.1 that in reported speech the present-
tense form in Hungarian may be used to designate an activity which
is actually completed. This is so because the reported event is
viewed not from the time of the reporting speech act, but from the
time of the first speech event at which time the reported event
was still on-going. In English, on the other hand, we can find
past tense forms used in indirect speech to designate activities
or states which are still on-going. In fact, in reported speech
in Hungarian one can find past, present, and future forms used to
refer to events which, viewed from the time of the reporting speech

event, are completely fulfilled, while English may in comparable
situations use the past tense to refer to events which, viewed
from the time of the reporting, may be past, on-going, or yet to
be fulfilled.[2] The latter phenomenon is possible because English
speakers have the convention of adjusting the tense form of the
reported event to the _form_ of the verb of reporting. Only a verb
of reporting in the present tense would be followed by a non-past
form when referring to an on-going event. If the event being re-
ported is over, or if the reporting verb has a form which is _mor-
phologically past_, then a past tense form follows. Illustrating
this with perhaps the commonest verb of reporting, _say_, and its
Hungarian equivalent _mondani_, we can list the following examples
as being typical:

Direct quotation	Reported speech
a. 1. "John _is_ sick."	He says John _is_ sick.
2. "János beteg."	Azt mondja, hogy János beteg.
b. 1. "John _is_ sick." (now)	He (just) said John _was_ sick.
2. "János beteg."	(Eppen) azt mondta, hogy János beteg.
c. 1. "John _is_ sick." (yesterday)	He said John _was_ sick.
2. "János beteg."	Azt mondta, hogy János beteg.
d. 1. "John _was_ sick."	He says John _was_ sick.
2. "János beteg _volt_."	Azt mondja, hogy János beteg _volt_.
e. 1. "John _was_ sick."	He said John _had been_ sick. (also _was_)
2. "János beteg _volt_."	Azt mondta, hogy János beteg _volt_.
f. 1. "John _is sitting_ on the floor."	He said John _was sitting_ on the floor.
2. "János a padlón _ül_."	Azt mondta, hogy János a padlón _ül_.
g. 1. "John _has been sitting_ on the floor for four hours." (either now or past)	He said that John _had been sitting_ on the floor for four hours. (also _has been sitting_)
2. "János már négy órája a padlón _ül_."	Azt mondta, hogy János már négy órája a padlón _ül_.

h. 1. "John <u>will</u> <u>be</u> here   He said John <u>would</u> <u>be</u> here tomorrow.
         tomorrow."
   2. "János holnap itt <u>lesz</u>." Azt mondta, hogy holnap itt <u>lesz</u>
                                        János.

i. 1. "John <u>will</u> <u>arrive</u>   He said John <u>would</u> <u>arrive</u> tomorrow.
         tomorrow."
   2. "János holnap   Azt mondta, hogy holnap János
         <u>megérkezik</u>."   <u>megérkezik</u>.

j. 1. "John <u>is</u> <u>arriving</u>   He said John <u>was</u> <u>arriving</u> tomorrow.
         tomorrow."
   2. "János holnap <u>érkezik</u>   Azt mondta, hogy János holnap
         <u>meg</u>."   <u>érkezik</u> <u>meg</u>.

k. 1. "What <u>is</u> her name?"   He asked what her name <u>was</u>.
   2. "Mi a neve?"   Azt kérdezte, hogy mi a neve.

l. 1. "Her name <u>is</u> Mary."   He said her name <u>was</u> Mary.
   2. "Mária a neve."   Azt mondta, hogy Mária a neve.

m. 1. "What <u>is</u> she <u>going</u> <u>to</u>   I wish I knew what she <u>was</u> <u>going</u> <u>to</u>
         <u>do</u> tomorrow?"   <u>do</u> tomorrow.
   2. "Mit <u>fog</u> <u>csinálni</u>   Bárcsak tudnám, hogy holnap mit
         holnap?"   <u>fog</u> <u>csinálni</u>.

The tendency in English, as can be seen from the above examples, is
to move the tense of the reported verb one "step" back in time;
present becomes past, past becomes past perfect, etc. However, in
actual practice some of the steps may not be followed at all lev-
els of standard usage. More details in this regard cannot be giv-
en here. However, I feel that enough examples have been presented
to show that Hungarian consistently regards the time of the origi-
nal event as being the more crucial, not the time of the reporting
speech event. English speakers are attracted by the <u>form</u> of the
verb of reporting, a "subjunctive" form which appears morphologi-
cally as a past tense form also influencing the choice of a non-
past form, as in m.1, even though the event is to be completed in
the future. It must be noted also that the English periphrastic
future has a shifted form in <u>would</u>.

306

18.3 Statal passive

Although voice as such has very little to do with aspect,
there is good reason for discussing the Hungarian statal passive at
this point in our study, for it may be easily confused with the
"real passive" of English, rather than the corresponding statal
passive. Since the passive voice is no longer a part of the con-
jugational system of Hungarian, such confusion could have detri-
mental effects on the ability of an English-speaking student to
communicate in Hungarian.

18.3.1 Statal passive vs. real passive. The statal passive
in English may have the identical verbal form as the real passive.
However, the statal passive is perfective in some sense since it
indicates the result of some previous action. If we consider the
widespread use of the passive voice in English as a device to fo-
cus attention on the object, rather than the subject of an action,
i.e., to make a topic out of what otherwise would be part of the
comment, we can more readily arrive at suitable Hungarian construc-
tions that achieve the same effect. In a few instances statal pas-
sives have a different second element than their real passive
counterparts, in which case less interference is to be expected.
But consider the following:

    a. 1. The door is closed at six.
       2. The door is closed (now).

The first of these sentences refers to a regularly-occurring event,
while the second refers to a state, the result of a previous ac-
tion. Only the first of these may be expanded by an agentive
phrase introduced by by, or converted to show the continuous as-
pect, is being closed. Since the effect of a.1 is to focus atten-
tion on the object while ignoring the actor, the most suitable

Hungarian translation would have the object in initial position, with the third person plural "general" subject being used, the latter being also possible in English:

b. 1. Az ajtót hat órakor zárják (be).
   2. They close the doors at six.

Needless to say, Hungarian may use other types of constructions to achieve the same sort of effect achieved by the use of the real passive in English. Several examples may suffice to illustrate this:

c. 1. The house is being painted.
   2. A ház festés alatt áll.   (lit., "stands under painting" cf. under construction)

d. 1. The house is being built.
   2. A ház építés alatt áll.

18.3.2 Statal passive constructions compared. After the very brief sketch of the real passive in English and some Hungarian semantic equivalents, we may now profitably compare the statal passives in the two languages to see how their superficial syntactic similarities can be the cause of considerable interference for the English-speaking student learning to speak Hungarian. Both constructions under discussion here are composite forms, the English auxiliary being a form of be, while the Hungarian auxiliary is a form of van. The second form in each construction is a non-finite one, the past participle in English, the present gerund in Hungarian. However, since the statal passive characteristically depicts the resultant state of some perfective action, the gerund is quite often built on a verb stem appearing with a perfective prefix in Hungarian, in which case the statal passive occurs in three parts, the auxiliary occurring between the prefix and the verb. Some typical examples of statal passives are:

a. 1. The door _is closed_.
   2. Az ajtó _be van zárva_. (or _zárva van_)

b. 1. The window _is open_.
   2. Az ablak _nyitva van_.

c. 1. The house _is painted_.
   2. _Be van festve_ a ház.

d. 1. I'_m satisfied_.
   2. _Meg vagyok elégedve_.

Note the reduced form of _opened_ which is used in the statal pas-
sive in English, and also the pre-positioning of the predicate for
emphasis in c.2. The crucial thing for the student to remember
here, however, is that if a verb form such as _is closed_ occurs
without an agent or an adverbial indicating a reoccurring event,
then the composite form denotes a state and may be translated by
the statal passive in Hungarian. If, on the other hand, such a
verb indicates a repeated event, we are dealing with a real pas-
sive, which must be translated into Hungarian by the active voice,
either with the "general" third-person plural subject if the Eng-
lish counterpart contains no expressed agent, or with the "agent"
as subject.

18.3.3 _"Reflexive verbs" vs. passives in Hungarian_. It must
be mentioned at this point that Hungarian has formative suffixes
which can be used to form "reflexive verbs" which on the surface
resemble passive verbs semantically since they permit nouns which
generally occur as objects of the simplex verbs to appear as sub-
jects of the resulting intransitive verbs. In several instances
the English equivalent may be the same for both the original and
derived verb:

a. 1. Siessünk, már _kezdik_ az előadást. (Bánhidi et al.
                                              1965:341)
   2. Let's hurry; the performance _is
      starting_ already. ('they are starting')

b. 1. Siessünk, már <u>kezdődik</u> az előadás.
   2. Let's hurry; the performance <u>is</u>
      <u>starting</u> already.

Although the -<u>ódik</u> suffix is productive, its use is so varied that
the student should be cautioned against attempting to match all
continuous intransitive verbs in English with an equivalent Hungar-
ian verb formed with this suffix, even though such verbs as <u>csukó-</u>
<u>dik</u> 'is closing,' i.e., 'is being closed,' do occur.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XVIII

1. See, for example, Tompa 1968:104ff.

2. As used here, "verb of reporting" is meant to include also those verbs which we have earlier designated "mental state verbs." These include such verbs as <u>think, consider, know</u>, and the like, which could take a clause object--with or without a conjunction--capable of being formed from a complete sentence, i.e., a "direct quotation."

310

CHAPTER XIX

THE CATEGORY OF NUMBER

19.0 Introduction

The category of number occurs as an obligatory category in the grammar of both English and Hungarian. This means that there are mandatory structural correlates associated with the semantic classification of, for example, "one" vs. "more than one." Other sorts of classification along these lines are also possible, of course, but they need not concern us here since the two number classes just mentioned are sufficient for discussing the phenomenon of number in English and Hungarian.

19.1 Pluralization

It is clear that the most obvious place for an English-speaking student to look for structural manifestations of the notion of number in Hungarian would be in the marking of the noun for plurality since this is the area where number is most noticeable in the grammar of English. However, while it is true that Hungarian, like English, does mark nouns with a special morpheme to indicate plurality, the plural morpheme in Hungarian is used with much less frequency than its English counterpart. That is to say, the Hungarian <u>noun</u> itself is not marked for plurality as often as the English noun is. With regard to countable <u>noun phrases</u>, on the other hand, the plural morpheme may occur in one form or other in Hungarian in all but a few cases.

19.1.1 <u>Non-possessive nominals</u>. Generally speaking, a noun phrase in both English and Hungarian is marked only once for plural. Thus, we have:

house	houses	the house	the houses	the pretty house(s)
ház	házak	a ház	a házak	a csinos ház(ak)

If, on the other hand, the noun phrase contains a quantifier of any kind, then there is a contrast. In Hungarian the quantifier is sufficient to serve as the marker of plurality, while in English the noun is still marked for plural except in a few cases. The following list is illustrative:

egy	ház	one	house	
két	ház	two	houses	
tíz	ház	ten	houses	
néhány	ház	several	houses	
több	ház	some	houses (also: __more houses__)	
sok	ház	many	houses	
számos	ház	numerous	houses	
hány	ház	how many	houses	
annyi	ház	so many	houses	
kevés	ház	(a) few	houses	
minden	ház	all	houses (also: __every house__)	

While all numerals in Hungarian pattern as above, there are several determiner-like adjectives formed from numerals which pattern as ordinary adjectives, and not as quantifiers. The most common of these is __egyes__: __egyes házak__ 'some houses' = 'certain houses'; also: __minden egyes ház__ 'every single house.' However, the true quantifiers always govern the singular noun, regardless of the actual number they designate. In addition to the ones listed above, the following might be noted: __számtalan ház__ 'innumerable houses' and __rengeteg ház__ 'an enormous number of houses.' An English parallel which might come to mind here is the use of the same form to refer to one or more animals, game animals in particular. However, this parallelism is only partial at best, for this type of usage is limited in English to the names of a relatively few entities, while the Hungarian pattern includes all nouns, regardless of the class to which they belong. Moreover, as we shall note below, while the English pattern resembles a singular morphologically, it

still patterns as a plural. The Hungarian patterns, on the other hand, always behave as singulars. Thus, in English we have "One sheep is ..." and "Two sheep are ..." and "One deer is ..." and "Two deer are ..." However, we also have "Two goats are ..." and "Two elephants are ..." and the like. If any meaningful generalization can be made in this regard for the English usage, it might be to the effect that names of fish tend to have unchanged plurals, and names of birds take the plural form, while some of the larger game animals are referred to with the unchanged plural, and others with the marked plural. For my own usage, the following sample list holds; for other speakers, different groupings:

two sheep	two fish(es)	two sharks
two moose	two buffalo(es)	two monkeys
two grouse	two pheasant(s)	two geese
two bass		two ducks
two pike		two crows
two perch		two hawks
two salmon, etc.		two rabbits, etc.

After a certain point, as already evidenced by the above list, the choice as to which category a certain name might belong to is an individual matter, dependent on the personal experiences of the speaker, and can hardly be further specified linguistically. To repeat, the Hungarian pattern is a grammatical phenomenon embracing all nouns.

19.1.1.1 Plural determiners. It can be seen from the above, then, that the only simple determiners in Hungarian which may collocate with the plural noun are the definite article and $\emptyset$. However, the demonstrative pronoun, when used with the definite article to form a demonstrative determiner, does agree with its associated noun in number (and case), which, in turn, brings up a special feature of English grammar, for a rare instance of an

-304-. 313

adjective or determiner of any kind being inflected in English oc-
curs with the use of the demonstratives. These agree in number
with the noun they modify. Hungarian, on the other hand, has two
possible demonstrative determiner patterns as equivalents, one of
which shows the same agreement in number as the English, while the
other (much less common) does not:

this house	ez a ház
these houses	ezek a házak (or: _e házak_)
that house	az a ház
those houses	azok a házak (or: _a házak_)

19.1.2 _Possessive nouns_. In Chapter XI we discussed posses-
sive constructions from the point of view of their definiteness.
These constructions will now be considered in regard to their be-
havior when variously marked for number. As can be noted from the
many examples of possessive constructions occurring in this study,
there is a separate morpheme employed to mark plurality in posses-
sives, namely -_i_. Thus, the non-possessive and possessive plurals
of _ház_ may be compared as follows, only the third person form being
given for the time being:

| a ház | a házak | a háza | a házai |
| the house | the houses | his house | his houses |

In the third person plural both plural morphemes may occur on the
same noun, one to indicate the plurality of the possessor, i.e.,
-_k_, the other the plurality of the possessed:

| a házuk | a házaik |
| their house | their houses |

However, when the possessor noun occurs as part of the possessive
construction in its usual preposed position, then the second plu-
ral marker is deleted:

| a tanárok háza__ | a tanárok házai__ |
| the teachers' house | the teachers' houses |

This holds even if the plural morpheme on the modifying noun is the
possessive plural -i:

> a tanáraim háza__   a tanáraim házai__
> my teachers' house   my teachers' houses

If, on the other hand, the possessor is emphasized by the employ-
ment of the personal pronouns in front of the possessed noun, then
the first plural morpheme is deleted. Compare:

én I	az <u>én</u> házam <u>my</u> house	az <u>én</u> házaim <u>my</u> houses
ő he	az <u>ő</u> háza <u>his</u> house	az <u>ő</u> házai <u>his</u> houses
mi we	a <u>mi</u> házunk <u>our</u> house	a <u>mi</u> házaink, etc. <u>our</u> houses
but: ők they	az <u>ő</u> házuk <u>their</u> house	az <u>ő</u> házaik <u>their</u> houses

These possessive relationships may be made even more emphatic by
the addition of the adjective <u>saját</u> 'own':

> a(z én) saját házam   a (mi) saját házunk, etc.
> my own house   our own house

This adjective has a semantic equivalent in the word <u>maga</u>, which
ought to be mentioned at this point because of its divergent syn-
tactic behavior. By "divergent" here I mean "divergent from the
behavior of adjectives in general," for morphologically and syntac-
tically <u>maga</u> is a noun. It is itself marked with the possessive
suffixes, and the noun it governs shows the ending of a third-per-
son possessor. Comparing the two emphatic constructions, we may
have:

or:	a saját há<u>za</u>m a ma<u>gam</u> há<u>za</u> my own house	a saját há<u>zunk</u> a ma<u>gunk</u> há<u>za</u> our own house	a saját há<u>zuk</u> a ma<u>guk</u> há<u>za</u> their own house

The "switch" here is not strictly one of number, but rather of per-
son, the practice of marking the possessor only once in the <u>maga</u>
construction being parallel to the tendency to mark the plural only

once in other possessive patterns.

19.1.2.1 Semantic interpretation of plural possessives. In addition to the obvious morphological contrasts between the English and Hungarian possessive constructions shown above, there may also be contrasts in the semantic interpretation of the possessives in regard to number if there is a plural morpheme somewhere in the construction. Thus the glosses given above for a házuk 'their house' should properly read 'their house(s)' since the Hungarian construction could refer to more than one house, each person involved being the owner of one house. Unless a communally owned (or lived in) house is meant, a házuk would ordinarily be translated into English as 'their houses,' since English looks at the aggregate of "possessed" entities, even in those instances where nature normally provides only one such entity per person, or where the prevailing cultural standards impose such a distribution. At times such use of the aggregate plural can be a source of humor even among native speakers of English:

a. 1. The pupils shook their heads.
   2. The teachers arrived with their wives.

In spite of the marking for plural, we normally assume that one of each entity is meant, while Hungarian (and German, Spanish, French, etc.) does not mark the possessed noun for plural for the very same reason. Thus, from the English point of view we may have two reductions in number occurring at the same time: 1) the plurality of the possessor is not indicated when the third-person plural possessor noun is juxtaposed with its possessed noun, and 2) the plurality of the possessed is left unmarked if it can be assumed that a distribution of one each is meant. Compare:

a tanár háza	the teacher's house
a tanárok háza	the teachers' house
with: a tanár felesége	the teacher's wife
a tanárok felesége	the teachers' wives

It must be remarked, however, that the last construction is always open to the polygamous interpretation, and that, moreover, there seems to be a tendency toward the aggregate plural since the use of the plural possessed is also found to occur without the polygamous interpretation. Therefore a tanárok feleségei 'the teachers' wives',' which parallels the English in regard to marking for number, is also heard as an alternate for the latter noun phrase. In addition to this, it must be remembered that in non-contiguous position, the plural possessor marker occurs on the possessed noun even though the possessor is overtly marked for plural. Compare the last-given noun phrase with the possessive construction in the following sentence:

> b. 1. A tanároknak szép feleségeik vannak.
> 2. The teachers have pretty wives.

which does occur as an alternate for:

> c. 1. A tanároknak szép felesége van.
> 2. The teachers have pretty wives.

The favored construction does have the singular marker, however. See below for further contrasts in number between English and Hungarian nouns of certain semantic areas.

19.2 Agreement in number

Broadly speaking, one agreement rule can be given to cover practically all cases of number agreement in both English and Hungarian, namely, "the predicate of a clause agrees with its subject in number." However, there are a considerable number of contrasts, both intra- and interlingual, in the ways in which this rule is applied.

19.2.1 <u>Agreement of verbal predicate.</u> While verbs generally agree in number with the subject, it becomes necessary to consider two types of number, actual or <u>real-world</u> number, and <u>grammatical</u> number, for there are many instances where more than one entity is being referred to by the use of singular grammatical forms, and, vice versa, plural forms being used in instances where only one entity is meant. The second-person personal pronoun in English is a prime example of the latter tendency, since <u>you</u> generally remains the same whether referring to one or more persons, although, as previously mentioned, some speakers do mark this form when more than one person is meant: <u>you all</u>, <u>y'all</u>, etc. Hungarian, on the other hand, has three plural forms to match the three singular forms, which we have discussed extensively in Chapter VI. Thus, the singulars <u>te</u>, <u>ön</u>, and <u>maga</u> have <u>ti</u>, <u>önök</u>, and <u>maguk</u> as their counterparts in the plural. However, these are actually contrasts involving person as well as number, since, as we have seen, <u>te</u> and <u>ön</u> require different person agreement in spite of their singular number. There are many other interlingual contrasts, however, which involve number. These stem for the most part from the fact that Hungarian nouns following a quantifier are <u>grammatically</u> singular within their own clause, but are semantically plural as evidenced by number agreement in subsequent parts of the discourse. The parallel which we cited to show that in some areas unmarked plural forms occur in English also was only partially valid, for in spite of the unchanged noun in <u>two sheep</u>, this form is grammatically plural as indicated by agreement: <u>Two sheep are</u> ... In Hungarian, on the other hand, a noun phrase such as <u>két ház</u> 'two houses' has the same verbal agreement as <u>egy ház</u> 'one house':

a.	1.	Egy ház áll.	One house _is standing._
	2.	Két ház áll.	Two houses _are standing._
	3.	Tíz ház áll.	Ten houses _are standing._
	4.	Sok ház áll. etc.	Many houses _are standing._ etc.

Further departure from the English pattern occurs when two such

subjects in Hungarian are conjoined with the co-ordinating conjunc-

tion _és_ (or _meg_) 'and.'

19.2.1.1 _Agreement with conjoined subjects._ While mathemati-

cally one plus one equals more than one in Hungarian, grammatically

this may not be the case. Two singular subjects conjoined by _és_

'and' generally govern a verb in the singular:

> a. 1. Egy férfi és egy asszony _áll_ a sarkon. (sg.)
>   2. A man and a woman _are standing_ on the corner.

This holds, of course, even when the subjects are "semantically"

plural but grammatically singular:

> b. 1. Két férfi és négy asszony _áll_ a sarkon. (sg.)
>   2. Two men and four women _are standing_ on the corner.

That this type of agreement is purely a grammatical matter and not

a case of different _Weltanschauung,_ or anything of that nature, is

evidenced by the fact that in subsequent discourse such "singular"

subjects are referred to in the plural:

> c. 1. Két férfi és négy asszony áll a sarkon.
>   Villamosra _várnak._ (pl.)
>   2. Two men and four women are standing on the corner.
>   _They are waiting_ for a streetcar.

It would be comforting for the beginning student of Hungarian to

be told some rule to the effect that if two such conjoined singu-

lar subjects in Hungarian are felt to be a close-knit unit, then

the singular verb is employed: if not, then the plural form of

the verb is used. Unfortunately, no such rule can be given, for

in c.l, for example, no unity seems to be felt in regard to the

subjects, even though the verb is in the singular. In other

situations, however, a native speaker may detect a semantic differ-
ence in the singular vs. plural verb form used after conjoined sin-
gular subjects. Note the English translations for a reflection of
this difference:

> d. 1. A férfi és a nő <u>olvas</u>. (sg.)
> 2. The man and the woman are reading (together).

vs.

> e. 1. A férfi és a nő <u>olvasnak</u>. (pl.)
> 2. The man and the woman are reading. (individually)

The question as to what activities can be viewed as being done in
unison or individually is still open and requires more research
with more examples tested by several informants before further
elaboration can be given.

19.2.2 <u>Agreement</u> <u>of</u> <u>predicate</u> <u>adjectives</u> <u>and</u> <u>nouns</u>. From
the Hungarian point of view it is unnecessary to segment predi-
cates into verbal and non-verbal predicates of any kind since in
Hungarian <u>all</u> predicates agree with their subjects in number. In
English, on the other hand, while verbal predicates and predicate
nouns agree in number with their subjects, predicate adjectives do
not. We shall examine the adjective constructions first.

19.2.2.1 <u>Predicate</u> <u>adjectives</u>. In Hungarian, unlike English
(and German), predicate adjectives agree in number with their sub-
jects. When the subject is clearly marked for plural, then the
predicate adjective is consistently marked for plural also. How-
ever, just as is the case with verbal predicates, there is vacilla-
tion between the singular and plural when there are singular sub-
jects connected by a co-ordinating conjunction. "Clearly marked"
plural subjects include those with the plural morpheme -<u>k</u>, with or
without the reinforcement of the plural demonstrative:

a. 1. A falak zöldek.
           2. The walls are green.

        b. 1. Ezek a tornyok magasak.
           2. These towers are high.

It ought to be mentioned at this point that Hungarian agrees with
English and contrasts with German in the fact that preposed adjec-
tives are not inflected. Thus noun phrases formed from the above
two sentences would be as follows:

        c. 1. a zöld_ falak
           2. the green walls

        d. 1. a magas_ tornyok
           2. the high towers

and, of course, would require plural agreement themselves when
used as subjects in turn:

        e. 1. A zöld_ falak régiek.
           2. The green walls are old.

It might also be useful at this point to remind the reader of what
was briefly discussed in 18.3 above, namely, that there is a con-
struction in Hungarian which resembles the copula-predicate noun
construction, though differing from it in several ways. This is
the "statal passive" construction formed with the copula (exclud-
ing the zero copula) plus the present gerund, which is uninflect-
ed. Compare the following:

        f. 1. Az ablakok nagyok voltak.   The windows were large.
           2. Az ablakok nyitva voltak.   The windows were open.

In the present tense, of course, zero copula is used in the adjec-
tive construction while van is required with the present gerund:

        g. 1. Az ablakok nagyok.   The windows are large.
           2. Az ablakok nyitva vannak.   The windows are open.

Conjoined singular subjects may have either singular or plural
agreement. Plural agreement is consistent with first or second
person plural connected subjects, while third person subjects may

be found with either:

h. 1. Te és én fiatalak vagyunk.
   2. You and I are young.

but: i. 1. Anna és Kati csinosok.
or   2. Anna és Kati csinos.
      3. Ann and Kate are pretty.

There seems to be a tendency, however, to have plural agreement with conjoined proper nouns, as will be further illustrated in the next section. One more example may be given here showing plural agreement after singular agreement with conjoined nouns:

j. 1. Két francia nő volt itt, ők csinosak voltak.
   2. Two French women were here. They were pretty.

19.2.2.2 Predicate nouns. In general, predicate nouns agree with their subject nouns in number in both English and Hungarian. However, the same type of vacillation in the Hungarian usage is found in the case of conjoined subjects in the third person. While again no fast rules can be formulated in this regard, there is a tendency to follow two or more proper nouns by plural predicate nominatives, as mentioned above. Thus we may have the following contrast in number:

a. 1. Mária és Anna tanulók.   Mary and Anne are pupils.
but: 2. A fiú és a leány tanuló.   The boy and (the) girl
                                   are pupils.

Again, the same sort of compounding of subject which would call for a first person plural verb would also call for a plural predicate noun under the same circumstances:

b. 1. Te és én dolgozók vagyunk.
   2. You and I are workers.

while a switch from singular agreement to plural agreement is also possible in the case of predicate nouns:

c. 1. Három elvtárs olasz, ők textilmunkások.
      (Bánhidi et al. 1964:435)
   2. Three comrades are Italian. They are textile
      workers.

-313- . 322

It might be mentioned at this point that the co-ordinating conjunction <u>meg</u> is often used to conjoin two entities felt to form a close-knit unit. Singular agreement seems to follow this conjunction naturally, often overriding a tendency toward pluralization under circumstances to be discussed in the next chapter:

    d. 1. A diszno meg a tehén hasznos <u>állat</u>.
       (Bánhidi et al. 1964:74)
     2. The pig and the cow are useful animals.

A similar type of generic statement with <u>és</u> may be found with either the singular or plural predicate noun:

    e. 1. A szilva és a szölő is gyümölcs(ök).
     2. The plum and the grape are fruit(s).

It makes a great difference in number agreement in Hungarian when "kinds or varieties of" a particular entity are meant, as we shall see in Chapter XX.

CHAPTER XX

SEMANTIC CONSIDERATIONS OF NUMBER

20.0 Introduction

In addition to the fact that there is a great deal of differ-
ence in the way nouns marked for plurality behave syntactically in
English and Hungarian, there are many differences to be found in
the number interpretation of lexical items which are otherwise
close equivalents in the two languages. This was already alluded
to in Chapter XIX, where it was mentioned that a semantic plural is
often not a grammatical plural in Hungarian. In this chapter we
will concentrate our attention on semantic classes of nouns which
show divergent interpretations for number in English and Hungarian.

20.1 Count-noun vs. non-count-noun

If one were to examine closely the list of grammatically sin-
gular noun phrases given in the list in 19.1.1, one might immedi-
ately presume that there is little distinction in Hungarian between
count-nouns and non-count-nouns. Such a presumption is correct,
for in addition to the fact that a pluralizable noun remains in the
singular after a quantifier, it can be observed that the same quan-
tifiers are used to indicate mass as well as number. In English,
on the other hand, the quantifier used in a given sentence depends
just as much on sentence type as noun type. It is well known that
in interrogative or negative sentences the distinction between
count-noun and non-count-noun in English is kept intact by the use
of different quantifiers, but that in affirmative, declarative sen-
tences the distinction is marked only by the plural morpheme on the
noun. In a few instances the distinction between a singular

non-count-noun and a plural count-noun is not shown, either mor-
phologically or syntactically, in English, thereby paralleling the
Hungarian pattern quite closely. We shall view these structures
by comparing count-noun and non-count-noun structures in Hungarian
and contrasting them with their English equivalents:

egy ház	a house	
víz	water	
sok ház	many houses	a lot of houses
sok víz	much water	a lot of water
kevés ház	few houses	a few houses
kevés víz	little water	a little water
annyi ház	so many houses	
annyi víz	so much water	
sok szarvas	many deer	a lot of deer
sok sör	much beer.	a lot of beer

Thus we observe that all Hungarian nouns occur in the singular
form, while English shows a plural form in the case of most count-
nouns, the unmarked plural count-nouns still patterning as plurals,
as we discussed in Chapter XIX.

20.1.1 Mass vs. individual object. In addition to the con-
trast in count-noun structures shown above, there is also a con-
trast in the way some objects are viewed in English and Hungarian.
Examples of this phenomenon are quite numerous in the broad area of
names for foodstuffs. Most foods are viewed as a mass in Hungari-
an, regardless whether the names belong otherwise to the count-
noun category. This is coupled with the fact often mentioned pre-
viously that the generic use of a noun in Hungarian involves pri-
marily the singular form. Thus, we can have:

	egy alma	one apple
and	sok alma	many apples

also   a. 1. _Almát_ veszek. (sg.)
             2. I'm going to buy _apples._

          b. 1. Nem szeretem/eszem az _almát._ (sg.)
             2. I don't like/eat _apples._   (*_the_ apple)

As indicated in 1.3, however, the singular form may be used in English also in a definitional construction. An example of this was given in 19.2.2.2:

          c. 1. A _szilva_ és a _szőlő_ is gyümölcs(ök).
             2. The _plum_ and the _grape_ are fruit(s).

While the singular is favored in a generic sentence such as c.1 above, the plural may also be used in Hungarian if "variety of, or kind of" is meant. In English, the unqualified name may also serve this purpose, but, quite often some sort of identification is used. Thus, the following are possible:

          d. 1. A jonatán jó _alma._
             2. The Jonathan is a good (variety of) _apple._

          e. 1. A jonatán és a grimes jó _almák._
             2. The Jonathan and the Grimes are good (varieties of) _apples._

In the non-generic sense however, Hungarian is very consistent in using the singular form, i.e., in viewing the foodstuff as a mass, while English may even use the plural form when a mass is meant. Thus, we say:

          f. 1. I had _a lot of_ beans/peas/mashed potatoes for
                lunch.
and not: 2. ?I had _many_ beans/peas/mashed potatoes for lunch.

Although we can speak of _two beans_ and _two peas_, and the like, we do not tend to consider the individual objects when eating them. Hungarian always tends to regard the _mass_ of objects, as does English (inconsistently) in other instances: _a lot of wheat, rice, barley, corn_, etc. Here the individual object must be indicated by a counter: _a grain of wheat, rice, corn_, etc., with one notable exception, _oats_, which is a mass noun with a plural form: _a lot of_

oats, a grain of oats, but not *one oat or *two oats. In refer-
ring to the individual object, Hungarian has the form szem 'grain,'
which may also be used as a counter for por 'dust,' homok 'sand,'
cukor 'sugar,' and the like.

20.1.1.1 Alternations between mass and object. In addition
to the fact that some semantic classes of nouns are considered in
the singular while others are considered in the plural, there are
other names in English which may be used to refer to either an ob-
ject or a mass (material) without a change of form. In English
this is generally achieved by the use of an overt article in oppo-
sition to zero:

a. 1. There's an egg on your plate. (object)
   2. There's egg on your plate. (material)

In the case of plural objects, on the other hand, the distinction
lies in the suffix since zero occurs before plural count-nouns and
singular non-counts:

b. 1. We eat a lot of chicken.
   2. We raise a lot of chickens.

This makes it possible to view the same activity from different
points of emphasis by the use of the contrasting suffixation:

c. 1. We eat a lot of chicken.
   2. We eat a lot of chickens.

Hungarian does not switch noun classes so readily in the case of
animal names, the word hús 'meat' generally being required to des-
ignate the food from the animal. Thus, the animal may be csirke
'chicken,' for example, but the food is csirkehús 'chicken(meat).'
Interlingual contrasts go even further, for in addition to the
"count-mass-noun" names like chicken and egg, there are the well-
known French borrowings now used for the names of the meat of some
domestic animals. These food names, too, are translated into

Hungarian as compounds of <u>hús</u>:

sheep	birka
mutton	birkahús
calf	borjú
veal	borjúhús
pig/hog	disznó/sertés
pork	disznóhús/sertéshús
but cattle (cow/ox/bull)	marha
beef	marhahús
and lamb	bárány
lamb	bárányhús

There are other names of animals, however, which in English also need the addition of another word to convert them to mass-nouns:

horse	ló
horsemeat	lóhús
buffalo	bölény
buffalo-meat	bölényhús

although <u>buffalo</u> may be heard for the latter English word also. Alternate forms also seem possible for <u>bear</u>(<u>meat</u>) and <u>rabbit</u>(<u>meat</u>), and others. However, just as in the case of the pluralization of names of animals, we are dealing with an area of usage which is quite individualistic or even regional, and consequently cannot be pursued further in this study. The important point in all this for the student studying Hungarian is the fact that the Hungarian requires compounding regardless of how readily the English count-noun converts to a mass-noun.

20.1.2 <u>Body parts as viewed for number</u>. The names of body parts are worthy of separate discussion here because of the further interlingual contrast they show. Not only is the mass vs. count-noun distinction hazy, but in the case of paired body parts, the pair itself may be viewed as a unit capable of being considered by halves. In discussing body parts consisting of more than two

distinguishable individual entities, Hungarian tends to favor the
singular, while English requires the aggregate plural, for example:

    a. 1. Jó foga van. (sg.)
       2. She has good teeth.

    b. 1. A kutya lába barna. (sg.)
       2. The dog's legs are brown.

The plurals of these nouns do occur, however, in identical or simi-
lar circumstances:

    c. 1. Szép fogai vannak.
       2. She has pretty teeth.

    d. 1. A kutya lábai barnák.
       2. The dog's legs are brown.

This phenomenon was discussed above in the previous chapter in our
considerations of pluralization of possessives.

20.1.2.1 Paired body parts. Body parts which come in pairs
are not only viewed as singulars, but as single units. If, for
example, one member of a given pair is missing, then one-half of
the unit is gone. Therefore, we not only have singular possessives
for such pairs:

    a. 1. Szép szeme van. (sg.)
       2. She has beautiful eyes.

but also:

    b. 1. Fél szemére vak. (lit., 'in half eye')
       2. He's blind in one eye.

    c. 1. Fél lábára sánta. ('half leg')
       2. He's lame in one leg.

A person afflicted with the first defect is félszemű 'one-eyed'
(lit., 'half eyed'), while one with the second is féllábú 'half
legged.' However, just as we have seen in other aspects of number
in Hungarian, there seems to be a diachronic change in progress,
for these older forms must now compete with alternate forms which
conform more to the usage of Western European languages. Thus we

-320- · 329

find egyszemű 'one-eyed' along side of félszemű, and egylábú 'one-legged' and so on. It might be mentioned at this point that, although my informant used the singular possessive when referring to a person's lungs, he insisted on the plural when referring to breasts:

d. 1. Egészséges tüdeje van. (sg.)
   2. She has healthy lungs.

but: e. 1. Szép mellei vannak. (pl.)
           2. She has beautiful breasts.

Incidentally, the fel- pattern does not seem to occur with either of the nouns immediately above.

20.1.3 _Appendages_ _for_ _paired_ _body_ _parts._ The fél- pattern is used, however, with names of clothing and other appurtenances associated with body parts occurring in pairs. Thus, fél kesztyű means 'half a pair of gloves' and not 'half gloves,',which is félkesztyű. Similarly, fél cipő is 'half a pair of shoes,' while félcipő is 'half-shoes.' Thus we can have:

a. 1. Barna cipőt vettem. (sg.)
   2. I bought (a pair of) brown shoes.

b. 1. Félcipőt vettem.
   2. I bought a pair of half shoes.

c. 1. Fél cipőt találtam. ('half a pair')
   2. I found a shoe.

Since quantifiers govern the singular in Hungarian, and since there often is no distinction made between a pair and a unit, we also find: egypár ház 'a couple of houses' vs. egy pár cipő 'a pair of shoes.' Again, the use of the plural with such nouns as cipő 'shoe' implies "kinds of," and not simply "more than one object."

20.2 _English_ _plurals_ _vs._ _Hungarian_ _singulars_ _with_ "paired objects"
        We have noted in several places above that English generally

makes more use of the plural morpheme than does Hungarian. This is true for the simple semantic reason of juxtaposition of quantifiers and nouns, or because individual objects are viewed in Hungarian while English views the aggregate. However there are two broad semantic areas where the use of the plural form in English occurs to designate a single object composed of two protruding and, more or less, bilaterally symmetrical parts.

20.2.1 "Paired" items of clothing. There are names of items of clothing in English which occur only in the plural, even though one single object may be referred to. Thus, besides a pair of shoes we may have:

a pair of shorts	a pair of pants	a pair of trousers
a pair of panties	a pair of bloomers	a pair of tights
a pair of pajamas	a pair of knickers	a pair of plus-fours
a pair of suspenders	a pair of glasses	a pair of spectacles

all of which differ from the first pattern since we can say a shoe, a sock, a garter, etc., but not *a pants or *a trousers and the like. In Hungarian, of course, the singular is used regardless of whether the "parts" of the given item are separable or not. Oddly enough, bra or brassiere--like shirt, blouse, and skirt--do not belong to the same type as panties and pants.

20.2.2 "Paired" tools in English. Just as single items of clothing may be designated with a noun in the plural, so also may the names of certain tools with two movable, bilaterally symmetrical parts be designated by a plural, the single object being likewise called "a pair of." Some of these tools are:

a pair of pliers	a pair of scissors	a pair of goggles
a pair of binoculars	a pair of field glasses	
a pair of tongs	a pair of shears	a pair of pincers
a pair of snippers	a pair of calipers	
		a pair of clippers

As all of these are translated by singular nouns in Hungarian, they need no special mention here.

20.3 General problems of number

Perhaps the greatest difficulty for the English-speaking student in learning to master the problem of number in Hungarian is the fact that Hungarian places little emphasis on the count-noun vs. non-count-noun distinction. Learning vocabulary in context (or from the usual dictionary, for that matter) often leaves the English-speaking student without what is to him vital to know. For example, is butor 'furniture' pluralizable or not as it is encountered in the following example?:

a. 1. Sok bútor van a szobámban.
   2. There is a lot of furniture in my room.

Upon encountering the following sentence the student learns that it indeed is pluralizable:

b. 1. A bútorok sárgák.
   2. The furniture is yellow. ('the furniture pieces')

Slight reassurance is gained when the student finds that bútordarab 'piece of furniture' can also be used in the last instance. Thus, the problem of mastering the use of number in Hungarian is like all the other grammatical problems: the student needs to hear thousands of examples of speech in context before he can internalize his own rules for the native speech that he hears. It is hoped that this partial analysis may help direct the student's attention to several important places to look for these rules.

REFERENCES

Ahlgren, Arthur. 1946. On the Use of the Definite Article with 'Nouns of Possession' in English. (Stockholm Studies in English 2.) Uppsala, Appelberg.

Allen, Harold B. (ed.) 1964. Readings in Applied English Linguistics. (Second Edition) New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Annear, Sandra. 1965. "English and Mandarin Chinese: Definite and Indefinite Determiners and Modifying Structures." Project on Linguistic Analysis No. 11, pp. 1-55. Columbus, The Ohio State University Research Foundation.

Antal, László. 1964. "On the Possessive Forms of the Hungarian Noun." Linguistics 3.50-61.

Bach, Emmon W. 1965. "On Some Recurrent Types of Transformations." in Charles W. Kreidler (ed.) Report of the Sixteenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics No. 18) Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.

_____. 1967. "Have and be in English Syntax." Lg. 43.462-85.

Banathy, Bela, Edith Crowell Trager, and Carl D. Waddel. 1966. "The Use of Contrastive Data in Foreign Language Course Development." in Albert Valdman (ed.) Trends in Language Teaching, pp. 35-56. New York, McGraw-Hill.

Bánhidi, Zoltán and Zoltán Jókay. 1960. Ungarisch über Ungarn. Budapest, Verlag für Lehrbücher.

_____, Zoltán Jókay, and Dénes Szabó. 1965. Learn Hungarian. Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó.

Barton, J. 1961. The Application of the Article in English. (National Physical Laboratory, Paper 32.) Teddington, Middlesex.

Báti, László and István Véges. 1966. Angol nyelvkönyv. Tanfolyamok és magántanulók számára. I. Rész. Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. Language. New York, Henry Holt.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. "Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication." Lingua 18.1-34.

Bull, William E. 1963. Time, Tense, and the Verb: A Study in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, with Particular Attention to Spanish. (University of California Publications, Volume 19.) Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.

Dezső, László.. 1965. "Notes on the Word Order of Simple Sentences in Hungarian." Computational Linguistics IV.3-59.

_____. 1967. "A magyar tárgyi bővítményes egyszerű mondatok szórendjének tipológiája." in A magyar nyelv története es rendszere. (Nyelvtudományi értekezések, No. 58.) Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

_____ and György Szépe. 1967. Adalélok a topic-comment problémához. Nyelvtudományi Közlemények 69.365-388.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1964. "Desentential Complement Verbs in English." Project on Linguistic Analysis No. 7, pp. 88-105. Columbus, The Ohio State University Research Foundation.

Foder, Jerry A. and Jerrold J. Katz. (eds.) · 1964. The Structure of Language. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.

Francis, W. Nelson. 1958. The Structure of American English. New York, Ronald Press.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1963. "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements." Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.) Universals of Language, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Gunter, Richard. 1963. "Elliptical Sentences in American English." Lingua 12.137-50.

Hall, Edward T. 1959. The Silent Language. Greenwich, Conn., Fawcett Publications

Hall, Robert A. Jr. 1944. Hungarian Grammar. (Language Monograph No. 21.) Baltimore, LSA.

Hathaway, Baxter. 1967. A Transformational Syntax: The Grammar of Modern American English. New York, Ronald Press.

Hill, Archibald A. 1966. "A Re-examination of the English Articles." in Francis P. Dineen, S.J. (ed.) Report of the Seventeenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics No. 19.) Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.

Jacobs, Roderick A. and Peter S. Rosenbaum. 1967a. Grammar 1: Developmental Edition. Boston, Ginn.

_____. 1967b. Grammar 2: Developmental Edition. Boston, Ginn.

Jesperson, Otto. 1965. The Philosophy of Grammar. New York, W. W. Norton and Company.

Karttunen, Lauri. 1968a. "What Do Referential Indices Refer To?" (RAND Corporation, Paper P-3854.)

_____. 1968b. "What Makes Definite Noun Phrases Definite?" (RAND Corporation, Paper P-3871.)

Katona, A. 1960. "Grammatical Difficulties of Hungarian Students Learning English." English Language Teaching 14.170-4.

Katz, Jerrold J. and Paul L. Postal. 1964. An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions. Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.

Keresztes, Kálmán. 1965. "About the Problem of the Hungarian 'Implicative.'" Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher 36.39-45.

Kiefer, Ferenc. 1967. On Emphasis and Word Order in Hungarian. (Indiana University Publications. Uralic and Altaic Series Vol. 76.) Bloomington, Indiana University.

Klagstad, Harold L. Jr. 1963. "The Opposition Definite/Non-definite in South Slavic Verb Morphology." Indiana Slavic Studies 3.35-41.

Koutsoudas, Andreas. 1966. Writing Transformational Grammars: an Introduction. New York, McGraw-Hill.

_____. 1968a. "The A over A Convention." Unpublished paper. Indiana University.

_____. 1968b. "On wh-words in English." Journal of Linguistics 4.267-73.

Kufner, Herbert. 1962. Grammatical Structures of English and German. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Kuroda, S.-Y. 1968. "English Relativization and Certain Related Problems." Lg. 44.244-66.

Lees, Robert B. 1960. The Grammar of English Nominalizations. (Publication Twelve of the Research Center for Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics.) Bloomington, Indiana University.

_____. 1961. "The Constituent Structure of Noun Phrases." American Speech 36.159-68.

_____ and E. S. Klima. 1963. "Rules for English Pronominalization." Lg. 39.17-28.

Lotz, János. 1939. Das ungarische Sprachsystem. Stockholm, Ungarisches Institut.

Lotz, John. 1962a. "The place of the implicative (-LAK) form in the conjugational pattern of Hungarian." MSFOu. 125.317-327.

_____. 1962b. "Semantic Analysis of the Tenses in Hungarian." Lingua. 11.256-62.

A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelvtudományi Intézete. 1959-66. A magyar nyelv értelmező szótára, I-VII. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Martinet, André. 1962. A Functional Theory of Language. London, Oxford University Press.

Nida, Eugene A. 1966. A Synopsis of English Syntax. (Second, revised edition.) The Hague, Mouton.

Országh, László. 1960. Angol-Magyar Szótár. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

_____. 1963. Magyar-Angol Szótár. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Postal, Paul. 1966. "On So-called 'Pronouns' in English." in Francis P. Dineen, S.J. (ed.) Report of the Seventeenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics No. 19.) Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.

Roberts, Paul. 1954. Understanding Grammar. New York, Harper and Row.

Rommetveit, Ragnar. 1968. Words, Meanings, and Messages: Theory and Experiment in Psycholinguistics. New York, Academic Press.

Rosenbaum, Peter S. 1967. The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions. (Research Monograph No. 47.) Cambridge, Mass., The MIT Press.

Sauvageot, Aurélien. 1951. Esquisse de la langue hongroise. Paris, Klincksieck.

Smith, Carlotta S. 1964. "Determiners and relative clauses in a generative grammar of English." Lg. 40.37-54.

Stockwell, Robert P., J. Donald Bowen, and John W. Martin. 1965. The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Strang, Barbara M. H. 1965. Modern English Structure. New York, St. Martin's Press.

Szabó, László. 1967. "Sätze mit faktitiven Verben im Ungarischen." Lingua 17.410-20.

Tompa, József. (ed.) 1961. A mai magyar nyelv rendszere. Leíró nyelvtan I. Budapest, Aakadémiai Kiadó.

_____. (ed.) 1962. A mai magyar nyelv rendszere. Leíró nyelvtan II. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

_____. 1968. Ungarische Grammatik. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó.

Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language. Springfield, Mass., G. and C. Merriam Company.

Zsilka, János. 1967. The System of Hungarian Sentence Patterns. (Indiana University Publications. Volume 67 of the Uralic and Altaic Series.) Bloomington, Indiana University.

END

DEPT. OF HEALTH
EDUCATION AND
WELFARE
U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION
ERIC
DATE FILMED

7-24-72