

Anti-agreeing infinitives in Old Hungarian*

Éva Dékány

Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences

1 Introduction

Infinitives in Modern Hungarian are well known for having a full ϕ -feature paradigm, that is, an inflection that co-varies with the ϕ -features of the infinitival subject. Representative examples are given in (1).¹

- (1) a. János-nak ki kell takaríta-ni-a a szobá-t.
John-DAT PRT have.to clean-INF-3SG the room-ACC
'John has to clean the room.'
- b. (Nekem) ki kell takaríta-n-om a szobá-t.
I.DAT PRT have.to clean-INF-1SG the room-ACC
'I have to clean the room.'

Inflected infinitives are possible only if the matrix predicate has a Dative noun phrase argument.² In (2), for instance, the matrix verb *lát* 'see' has no Dative argument, and the ϕ -feature inflection on the infinitive is ruled out.

- (2) (Én) lá-t-am János-t olvas-ni-(*a).
I see-PST-1SG John-ACC read-INF-3SG
'I saw John read.'

Whether there is a correlation between the syntactic position of the Dative noun phrase and the presence of inflection is a debated issue. According to É. Kiss (2002: 216), the judgments show a clean cut: inflection on the infinitive is i) obligatory if the Dative noun phrase is thematically part of the infinitive, ii) optional if it may belong either to the infinitive or the matrix predicate, and iii) impossible if it unambiguously belongs to the matrix clause. Tóth (2002: 148), on the other hand, reports that the judgments show considerable inter-speaker variation, and there is no clear correlation between the syntactic position of the Dative noun phrase and the presence or lack of inflection on infinitives.

*I thank Marcel den Dikken for useful discussion and the two anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments, which helped me to improve the manuscript. This material is based upon work supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund under grant OTKA 112057 (Hungarian Generative Diachronic Syntax 2) and a postdoctoral grant of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

¹The paper contains the following abbreviations: 1.SUBJ.2OBJ: first person subject agreement fused with second person object agreement, ABL: ablative case, ACC: accusative, ATTR: attributivizer, C.: Codex, CAUS: causative, COND: conditional, DAT: dative, IMP: imperative, INF: infinitive, PART: participle, PASS: passive, PL: plural, POSS: possessive, PRT: verbal particle, PST: past, Q: question particle, SBJ: subjunctive, SG: singular.

²Pronominal Dative arguments can undergo pro-drop, as in (1b); their referential content can be recovered from the the infinitival agreement.

Inflected infinitives were already in place in the first surviving coherent Hungarian text, the 50-line Funeral Sermon and Prayer (1192–1195).

- (3) ki-nec odut hotolm ovdo-ni-a ej ket-ni-e
 who(sg)-DAT given power lose-INF-3SG and bind-INF-3SG
 ‘who was given power to bind and lose’ (Funeral Sermon and Prayer)

The full infinitival paradigm is given in (4).³

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>(4) a. men-n-em
 go-INF-1SG
 (for me) to go (Soproni Virág-
 ének)</p> <p>b. men-n-ed
 go-INF-2SG
 (for you) to go (Horvát C. 122v)</p> <p>c. men-ni-e
 go-INF-3SG
 (for him) to go (Kazinczy C. 27r)</p> | <p>d. men-n-wnk
 go-INF-1PL
 (for us) to go (Könyvecse 14r)</p> <p>e. men-n-etek
 go-INF-2PL
 (for you) to go (Jókai C. 82)</p> <p>f. mē-ni-ec
 go-INF-3PL
 (for them) to go (Vienna C. 301)</p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

However, in Old Hungarian (henceforth OH, 826–1526 A.D.) inflected infinitives have a different distribution than in Modern Hungarian: inflection is possible on all infinitives, irrespective of whether or not the matrix predicate has a Dative noun phrase argument (see Tóth 2000; 2002; 2011 and the examples in section 2).

Furthermore, OH infinitives can optionally feature a 3SG ending irrespective of the person and number features of the infinitive’s subject. Observe (5), where the expected inflection would be 1SG, and (6), where we would expect 2PL ending.

- (5) nem jö-tt-em hŷ-nŷ-a az jġgaz-ak-ath
 not come-PST-1SG call-INF-3SG the righteous-PL-ACC
 ‘I have not come to call the righteous’ (Könyvecse 29r)
- (6) akar-na-tok-ee ven-nŷ-e
 want-COND-2PL-Q take-INF-3SG
 ‘would you(pl) want to take it?’ (Jókai C. 22)

Compare the regularly inflected forms of these infinitives with the same types of subjects and the same matrix verbs:

- (7) nem iö-tt-em hy-n-om igaz-ak-ot
 not come-PST-1SG call-INF-1SG righteous-PL-ACC
 ‘I have not come to call the righteous’ (Döbrentei C 205v)
- (8) ha gozödelm-eth akkar-tok raitok uen-n-otok
 if victory-ACC want-2PL on.them take-INF-2PL
 ‘if you want (to take) victory over them’ (Kazinczy C. 66r)

The phenomenon whereby a verb bears an invariant, default agreement regardless of the ϕ -features of the subject is known as anti-agreement and is attested in a variety of languages,

³The written form of the infinitival suffix in Modern Hungarian is *-ni*. In Old Hungarian, however, orthography is not standardized, and this suffix is written in three different forms: *-ni*, *-ny*, and *-nŷ*. In both Modern and Old Hungarian, the *i/y/ŷ* vowel is dropped from the suffix if the infinitive bears a first or second person inflection.

among them Berber, Bantu, and Celtic languages, as well as Imbabura Quechua and some Italian dialects (see Ouhalla 1993; 2005, Richards 2001, Elouazizi 2005, Schneider-Zioga 2007, Ouali 2008, Baker 2008a;b among others). However, to the best of my best knowledge, anti-agreement in infinitives has not yet been documented in other languages.

In this paper inflected infinitives whose inflection co-varies with the ϕ -features of the subject/controller, e.g. (3) and (4), will be referred to as agreeing infinitives. I will term inflected infinitives like (5) and (6) as anti-agreeing infinitives. ‘Inflected infinitives’ will be a cover-term for agreeing and anti-agreeing infinitives. Infinitives that feature the infinitival suffix without a person-number ending, for instance (2), will be called uninflected infinitives.⁴

The purpose of this paper is to examine the distribution of OH anti-agreeing infinitives and speculate on how this anti-agreement arises. The paper is structured as follows. In section 2 I examine the distribution of uninflected, agreeing, and anti-agreeing infinitives in OH. In section 3 I review and argue against the analysis of anti-agreement put forth in descriptive historical grammars. In Section 4 I show that anti-agreement has a small fossil in Modern Hungarian, but it is a different phenomenon from anti-agreement in OH. Section 5 argues that anti-agreement is default agreement in OH, while Section 6 speculates on why default agreement arises on OH infinitives. Finally section 7 concludes my discussion.

2 The distribution of uninflected, agreeing, and anti-agreeing infinitives

As discussed in the introduction, OH features uninflected, agreeing, and anti-agreeing infinitives. Tables 1 through 7 summarize the number of the three types of infinitives in OH from seven codices. The Jókai Codex is the first surviving Hungarian codex. The text was translated from Latin around 1370 but the surviving codex is a copy of this text from 1446. The Vienna Codex is from the middle of the 15th century. The infinitives in these codices were counted by Károly (1956).⁵

	uninflected	agreeing	anti-agreeing
1SG	23	24	4
1PL	2	5	∅
2SG	13	23	3
2PL	4	6	2
3SG	211	37	N/A
3PL	52	4	13
	305	99	22

Table 1: Infinitives in the Jókai Codex (token number: 23194)

⁴Hungarian does not feature an infinitival complementizer at any point in its recorded history. In this sense Old Hungarian uninflected, agreeing, and anti-agreeing infinitives are all ‘bare infinitives’.

⁵The token numbers were taken from <http://corpus.nytud.hu/hgds-dev/hu-texts.html>, an online Old Hungarian corpus (see Simon & Sass 2012), and indicate the word count in the OH text without punctuation marks.

	uninflected	agreeing	anti-agreeing
1SG	∅	29	∅
1PL	∅	9	∅
2SG	∅	34	∅
2PL	1	21	∅
3SG	200	3	N/A
3PL	61	53	1
	262	149	1

Table 2: Infinitives in the Vienna Codex (token number: 55294)

The Guary Codex is from before 1508, while the Könyvecse was copied in 1521. These codices are normalized and morphologically analyzed and annotated in the online OH corpus, and their infinitives were searched with the corpus query tool. Among infinitives with a 3SG ending, anti-agreeing ones were singled out by manual checking.

	uninflected	agreeing	anti-agreeing
1SG	∅	7	2
1PL	1	14	1
2SG	11	4	4
2PL	∅	∅	∅
3SG	59	79	N/A
3PL	9	8	8
	80	112	15

Table 3: Infinitives in the Guary Codex (token number: 21714)

	uninflected	agreeing	anti-agreeing
1SG	1	4	1
1PL	1	3	∅
2SG	3	3	∅
2PL	∅	∅	∅
3SG	44	3	N/A
3PL	18	5	1
	67	18	2

Table 4: Infinitives in the Könyvecse (token number: 9757)

The Székelyudvarhely Codex is from between 1526 and 1528, the Kazinczy Codex is from between 1526 and 1541, and the Bod Codex is from the early 16th century. These codices are normalized but not morphologically analyzed or annotated in the online OH corpus. Their infinitives were retrieved by searching the uninflected infinitival ending *-ni* and the inflected infinitival endings for all persons and numbers. Hits that yielded words other than infinitives were filtered out manually. Anti-agreeing infinitives were identified from among infinitives with

a 3SG ending manually, and the ϕ -features of the subjects of uninflected infinitives were also identified manually.

	uninflected	agreeing	anti-agreeing
1SG	\emptyset	2	\emptyset
1PL	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
2SG	1	4	\emptyset
2PL	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
3SG	8	4	N/A
3PL	10	7	3
	19	17	3

Table 5: Infinitives in the Székelyudvarhely Codex (token number: 38048)

	uninflected	agreeing	anti-agreeing
1SG	\emptyset	22	\emptyset
1PL	\emptyset	6	\emptyset
2SG	\emptyset	31	\emptyset
2PL	\emptyset	7	\emptyset
3SG	42	121	N/A
3PL	9	4	27
	51	191	27

Table 6: Infinitives in the Kazinczy Codex (token number: 20027)

	uninflected	agreeing	anti-agreeing
1SG	\emptyset	7	3
1PL	\emptyset	4	2
2SG	\emptyset	13	8
2PL	\emptyset	\emptyset	1
3SG	2	99	N/A
3PL	1	1	6
	3	124	20

Table 7: Infinitives in the Bod Codex (token number: 10084)

While anti-agreeing infinitives have not been described in other languages, agreeing infinitives are known to exist in European and Brazilian Portuguese (Raposo 1987, Pires 2001; 2006, Modesto 2007), Sardinian (Jones 1993, Miller 2003), Galician (Longa 1994), Old Neapolitan (Miller 2003, Scida 2004) as well as two Spanish dialects: Old Leonese and Mirandese (Scida 2004).⁶ As pointed out in Miller (2004: 330), in these languages the uninflected infinitive "correlates with PRO subjects in any case", while the inflected infinitive correlates with "lexical and

⁶In the above mentioned languages, as in (Old) Hungarian, it is the infinitival verb that bears agreement. In Welsh, on the other hand, it is the infinitive marker *i* that may take an agreement suffix, see Miller (2004).

pro subjects in the nominative". This correlation does not hold in Old Hungarian, however: both infinitives with a PRO subject and a lexical/pro subject feature uninflected as well as agreeing infinitives; the two types of infinitives appear to be in free variation (Tóth 2002; 2011).

OH infinitives may serve as a subject, as an object, or as an adjunct in the clause. The subject position of infinitives may be occupied by a referentially independent subject (only with monadic matrix predicates), or a trace (ECM infinitives and infinitives complements to raising verbs), or PRO.

A referentially independent subject is possible only if the matrix predicate is monadic, i.e. its only argument is the infinitival clause. Such predicates are epistemic modals (e.g. *kell* 'must' in one of its uses), non-directed deontic modals (e.g. *kell* 'must' in another use), and nominal predicates without an Ablative DP (e.g. *szemtelenység* 'impertinence' without such a DP). As these matrix predicates do not have a DP argument, the infinitive cannot have a PRO subject because there is no potential controller for it. Referentially independent subjects bear Dative case.

The ECM matrix verbs of OH are permissive verbs. Permissive verbs in OH can take either an Accusative or a Dative permissée (for instance *hagy valaki-t* 'let somebody-ACC' or *hagy valaki-nek* 'let somebody-DAT'). ECM structures arise when the permissée is Accusative.

The control structure is obligatory if the matrix predicate takes a DP argument that may potentially control the infinitive's subject (Tóth 2000; 2002; 2011, É. Kiss 2002). The relevant predicates are: subject oriented deontic modals (e.g. *kell* 'must' in a third type of use), evaluative predicates (for instance *fontos* 'important', *jólesik* 'feels good'), permissive verbs with a Dative permissée (e.g. *hagy valaki-nek* 'let/command somebody-DAT'), and nominal predicates with an Ablative DP (e.g. *szemtelenység valaki-től* 'impertinence somebody-ABL').

2.1 Control infinitives

As pointed out above, if the matrix predicate has a noun phrase argument, then the infinitive has to have a PRO subject and a control structure ensues. The controller may play the role of the subject, object, or Dative experiencer in the matrix predication, or it can be an Ablative noun phrase in the matrix clause. The possible combinations (based on Károly 1956 and Tóth 2000; 2002; 2011 but slightly differing from their classification) are shown in Table 8.

the controller	the infinitive in the clause		
	subject	object	adjunct
subject	N/A	✓	✓
object	–	–	✓
Dative experiencer	✓	✓	–
Ablative	✓	✓	–

Table 8: Control in OH infinitives

Uninflected infinitives are attested with all types of infinitives except for Ablative control into object infinitives. I take this to be an accidental gap in the data.⁷

⁷Uninflected and agreeing infinitives are in free variation in OH subject, object, and Dative control structures, and the null hypothesis is that this is also the case in Ablative control structures. Ablative control infinitives are very rare in OH. The expansion of the normalized part of the online OH corpus holds out the possibility that more examples of Ablative control will be found later on, and some of these may be object infinitives.

- (9) Ne akar-y-atok ty ffel-ny
not want-IMP-2PL youPL afraid-INF
'do not be afraid'⁸ (Jordánszky C. 450) subject control into an object inf.
- (10) Es iq-nèc èzec meg-yèzt-èni ok-èt·
and come-3PL these PRT-terrify-INF they-ACC
'and they are coming to terrify them' (Vienna C. 296) subject control into an adjunct inf.
- (11) hal-lak teged-ett zol-nÿ
hear-1 SUBJ.2OBJ you-ACC speak-INF
'I can hear you speak' (Jókai C. 45) object control
- (12) az isten-nek any-a-nak alkolmas volt meg hal-ny·
the God-DAT mother-POSS-DAT timely was PRT die-INF
'it was timely for God's mother to die' (Horvát C. 70v) dative control into a subject inf.
- (13) hagy-aa az kólrwl all-ok-nak a hŕz zay-a-t arczwl
command-PST.3SG the around stander-PL-DAT the his mouth-POSS-ACC in.the.face
ver-ny
strike-INF
'he commanded those standing beside him to stike him on the mouth' (Jordánszky C. 783) dative control into an object inf.
- (14) zent fferencz-tewl vala zerez-tet-ett ez-t mond-anÿ
saint Francis-ABL be.PST procure-PASS-PART this-ACC say-INF
'this was said by Saint Francis' (Jókai C. 42) ablative control into a subject inf.

Agreeing infinitives, that is, infinitives showing full agreement for the ϕ -features of the subject, are found in all subtypes of control infinitives except for Ablative control into an object infinitive. I take this to be an accidental gap in the data.

- (15) ne akar-i-atok fel-n-etèc
not want-IMP-2PL fear-INF-2PL
'do not be afraid' (Munich C. 42ra) subject control into an object inf.
- (16) Mert nem iq-tt-em hy-n-om igaz-ak-ot
because not come-PST-1SG call-INF-1SG righteous-PL-ACC
'I have not come to call the righteous' (Döbrentei C. 205v) subject control into an adjunct inf.
- (17) lat-lac teged-et ekepen all-an-od
see-1 SUBJ.2OBJ you-ACC this.way stand-INF-2SG
'I can see you stand this way' (Miskolc Fragment 2v) object control
- (18) le-gyen alkolmas en-nek-em zol-n-om ty-nek-tek
be-SBJ.3SG suitable I-DAT-1SG talk-INF-1SG you-DAT-2PL
'let me speak freely to you' (lit: let it be suitable for me to speak to you) (Jordánszky C. 712) dative control into a subject inf.

⁸The literal translation of this sentence is *do not want to be afraid*. Here the Old Hungarian text follows the Latin structure *nolite timere* (not.want.IMP.2PL afraid-INF) 'do not want to be afraid'. I thank Barbara Egedi for clarification on this point.

- (19) *hagy-ad en nek-em be tellyefeyt-en-em az-t. ammy-re iev-tt-em*
 let-SBJ.2SG I DAT-1SG PRT fulfill-INF-1SG that-ACC that-for come-PST-1SG
 ‘let me fulfill what I have come for’ (Cornides C. 113v) dative control into an object inf.
- (20) *erdömli isten-tul gacorta meg bočat-ni-a*
 deserve God-ABL often PRT forgive-INF-3SG
 ‘often deserves that God forgive (his sins)’ (Guary C. 104) Ablative control into an object inf.

Uninflected and agreeing infinitives are in free variation (Tóth 2002; 2011). When the same Latin text has multiple translations in OH, one codex may use an uninflected infinitive and another an agreeing infinitive in the translation of the same sentence, compare (9) and (15) and (21a) and (21b).

- (21) a. *ƒokan kereƒ-nek bel me-ny*
 many seek-3PL in go-INF
 ‘many seek to enter’ (Jordánszky C. 576)
- b. *ƒokac kèrèƒ-n^c bè-men-ni-èc*
 many seek-3PL in-go-INF-3PL
 ‘many seek to enter’ (Munich C. 72 rb)

The optionality of the agreement can also be observed within the same codex.

- (22) *s-ew-ny nem akar-t uala*
 and-come-INF not want-PST.3SG be.PST
 ‘and he did not want to come’ (Jókai C. 10)
- (23) *Eljas nem akar en haz-am jew-ny-e*
 Elijah not want I to-1SG come-INF-3SG
 ‘Elijah does not want to come to me’ (Jókai C. 6)

Uninflected and agreeing infinitives can also be coordinated.

- (24) *tud-yak my-tt kel tarta-ny-ok Es my-t el-tauoz-tatt-ny*
 know-3PL what-ACC must keep-INF-3PL and what-ACC away-leave-CAUS-INF
 ‘they know what they need to keep and what they need to keep away (from themselves)’ (Jókai C. 119))

Finally, anti-agreeing infinitives are found in all types of control infinitives except for Ablative control into subject infinitives. The only anti-agreeing Ablative control example that I am aware of is found with Ablative control into an object infinitive.

- (25) *Ne akar-y-atok feel-ny-e.*
 not want-IMP-2PL fear-INF-3SG
 ‘do not be afraid’ (Jordánszky C. 55) subject control into an object inf.
- (26) *nem jo-tt-em hy-ny-a az ygaz-ak-ath*
 not come-PST-1SG call-INF-3SG the righteous-PL-ACC
 ‘I have not come to call the righteous’ (Könyvecse 29v) subject control into an adjunct inf.

- (27) lat-lak vala fi-a-m giokarta suyr-ni-a
see-1SUBJ.2OBJ be.PST son-POSS-1SG often cry-INF-3SG
'I see you, my son, cry often' (Weszprém C. 17r)
- (28) ha alkomas en-nÿ-e med aʒok-balal ewangeliumm-ÿ tart-ok-na
if suitable eat-INF-3SG all that-from gospel-ATTR hold-PL- DAT
'if it is expedient for the followers of the gospels to eat of all those' (Jókai C. 16) dative control into a subject inf.
- (29) en magam-at hat-t-am en zeretŕ-i-m-nec zertelen
I self-ACC let-PST-1SG my lover-POSS.PL-1SG-DAT excessively
fogdoŕ-ni-a, es zorongat-ni-a
paddle.on-INF-3SG and press.hard-INF-3SG
'I let my lovers to paddle on me and press hard on me excessively' (Guary C. 94) dative control into a complement inf.
- (30) johha ne laŕ-f-onc te tuŕ-ed fia-t zuŕ-ni-e
never not see-SBJ-1PL you ABL-2SG son-ACC give.birth-INF-3SG
'let us never see you give birth to a son' (Guary C. 103) ablative control

Anti-agreeing infinitives may be coordinated with agreeing infinitives.⁹

- (31) kÿ-k ÿgér-ÿk on magok-at megh zeploŕŕt-enÿ-ek az teh
who-PL promise-3PL them self-ACC PRT violate-INF-3PL the your
zenthsegh-i-d-eth, Es megh fertezet-nÿ-e az teh zent
sacrament-POSS.PL-2SG-ACC and PRT violate-INF-3SG the your holy
new-ed-nek haÿléék-a-t
name-2SG-DAT house-POSS-ACC
'who promise themselves to violate thy sanctuary, and defile the dwelling place of thy name' (Székelyudvarhely C. 30r)

Anti-agreement is independent of the linear order of the matrix predicate and the infinitive (32) and the order of the controller and the infinitive (33).

- (32) a. mely retenetes lezen te-nek-ed a criftuŕ-th lat-ny-a az
how terrible will.be you.sg-DAT-2SG the Christ-ACC see-INF-3SG the
ítilet-ben
judgment-in
'How terrible it will be for you to see Christ at the (Last) Judgment' (Teleki C. 253)
- b. es nez-ny-e vtalatos ew zem-ek-uel
and see-INF-3SG loathsome their eye-3PL-with
'and it is loathsome for them to see it with their eyes' (Jókai C. 125)
- (33) a. nem az mv wezedelmv nk-éérth hÿg-ŕvk [tortéént-nek len-nÿ-e]
not for our destruction-for believe-SBJ.1PL transpired-DAT be-INF-3SG
ezek-et mÿ raÿtvk
these-ACC us on

⁹I do not have any examples in which an anti-agreeing infinitive is coordinated with an uninflected infinitive. I take this to be an accidental gap in the data. Since uninflected infinitives may be coordinated with agreeing infinitives, and the latter can be coordinated with anti-agreeing infinitives, it stands to reason to assume that coordinating uninflected and anti-agreeing infinitives was also a possibility.

‘let us believe that these (scourges of the Lord) have happened not for our destruction’ (Székelyudvarhely C. 26v)

- b. Jnt-lek teghed-et [keesen zolo-nak len-nÿ-e]
 warn-1SUBJ.2OBJ you.SG-ACC slow speaking-DAT be-INF-3SG
 ‘I warn you to be slow to speak’ (Winkler C. 65r)

Anti-agreeing infinitives are found in almost all linguistic records (A. Jászó 1992).¹⁰

2.2 ECM infinitives

ECM matrix verbs are found with uninflected, agreeing, and anti-agreeing infinitives as well.

- (34) nem haggÿah az lelk-eth az sötethsegek-reh men-nÿ
 not let.3SG the soul-ACC the darkness-to go-INF
 ‘he does not let the soul go into darkness’ (Könyvecse 9v)
- (35) hagÿ engemet egÿeb kewzewnet-ÿt mond-an-om
 let.2.IMP me different thanks-ACC say-INF-1SG
 ‘let me say a different thanks’ (Jókai C. 90)
- (36) ne(m) engomet hag-ot vr y zolgalo leañ-a-t meg
 not me let-PST.3SG Lord his servant maid-POSS-ACC PRT
 fortoz-tet-ni-e
 blemish-PASS-INF-3SG
 ‘the Lord did not let me, his servant, get blemished’ (Guary C. 114)

2.3 Raising infinitives

Raising matrix verbs are also found with uninflected, agreeing, and anti-agreeing infinitives.

- (37) kèzd-è gondol-ni
 begin-PST.3SG consider-INF
 ‘began to consider’ (Vienna C. 91)
- (38) kēzd-ē-nc ãir-ń-oc
 begin-PST-3PL weep-INF-3PL
 ‘they began to weep’ (Vienna C. 2)
- (39) kez-d-e-k en-es erõffen syr-ny-a
 start-PST-1SG I-too very.much cry-INF-3SG
 ‘I, too, started to cry very much’ (Teleki C. 299)

2.4 Infinitives with a non-coreferent Dative subject

Infinitives with a Dative marked lexical subject are selected by epistemic modals, non-directed deontic modals and nominal predicates. Such matrix predicates, however, are much more scarce

¹⁰The first Hungarian Bible translation, the so-called Hussite Bible, was prepared in the first half of the 15th century. While the original work is lost, the Munich Codex, the Vienna Codex, and the first part of the Apoc Codex are copies of this translation. The Munich Codex is one of the OH codices that contains no anti-agreeing infinitives, and the Vienna Codex has only a single anti-agreeing infinitive (Károly 1956). (The Apoc Codex in the OH corpus is neither morphologically analyzed nor normalized; whether this codex contains anti-agreeing infinitives, and if so, how many, is not yet known). As both earlier codices (eg. the Jókai Codex) and later texts (for instance the Székelyudvarhely Codex) feature anti-agreeing infinitives, the almost complete lack of such infinitives in the Munich Codex and the Vienna Codex could be a dialectal feature.

than those that select for a control, raising, or an ECM infinitive. Among matrix predicates selecting for an infinitive, verbal predicates are by far more common than nominal predicates. Furthermore, modals in these texts are typically deontic and directed.¹¹

Infinitives with a Dative marked lexical subject may be uninflected (40) or agreeing (41). In (40) *kel* ‘must’ is a non-directed deontic modal. The Dative DP is inanimate, so it cannot be the recipient of obligation; the obligation is localized in some other individual. Consequently, this DP cannot be interpreted as a Dative experiencer in the matrix clause; it is the overt subject of the infinitive instead. (41) features a nominal predicate.

- (40) *kel-uala [ew 3er3et-e-nek nagy 3oka33ag-ban ter3ed-n3]*
have.to-be.PST his order-POSS-DAT great multitude-in spread-INF
‘his order had to spread among great multitudes of people’ (Jókai C. 13)
- (41) *Hewsag [nek-thek wylaagh elewth fel kel-n-ethek]*
vanity DAT-2pl world in.front.of up get-INF-2PL
‘it is vanity for you to stand up in front of the world’ (Festetics C. 85)

In my sample, which contains 107 anti-agreeing examples (all the anti-agreeing infinitives of the seven codices in Tables 1 through 7, and gleaning examples from seventeen other codices and two legends¹²), there are no anti-agreeing infinitives with a monadic matrix predicate.

3 Previous treatments of OH infinitival anti-agreement

Previous discussions of OH anti-agreeing infinitives are all couched in the framework of descriptive historical linguistics (Keresztes 1953: 341, Károly 1956: 67–70, A. Jászó 1992: 412, 422, a.o.). Observing that the *-a/-e* inflection on an infinitive co-occurs with non-3SG subjects, too, these works conclude that *-a/-e* cannot be a 3SG agreement suffix. They suggest that *-a/-e* originated as a 3SG agreement but lost its 3SG value, ceased to be an agreement suffix, and amalgamated with the infinitival marker *-ni/-ny/-n3* (see esp. Keresztes 1953: 341 and A. Jászó 1992: 422). This gave rise to a new, monomorphemic infinitival suffix *-nia/-nya/n3a/-nie/-nye/-n3e*, which was used as an alternative variant of the original infinitival suffix *-ni/-ny/-n3*. In other words, in this approach the infinitival form in (42) should be analyzed as in (43), and it is morphologically equivalent to the uninflected infinitive in (44).

¹¹(ib) below is a rare example of an epistemic modal.

- (i) a. *az ire3seg ez-t mond-’a, Sokak-at te-het-z kik-et amaz nem*
the jealousy this-ACC say-PST.3SG many-ACC do-POSS-2SG that-ACC other.one not
te-het-i
do-POSS-3SG
‘Jealousy said: you can do many things that that other one cannot do’
- b. *Azert nekm kell len-n3-e nek-i fell’ebvalo-nak naladnal*
therefore nekm must be-INF-3SG DAT-3SG senior-DAT than.you
‘therefore he must be senior to you’ (Bod C. 7v)

The unglossed *nekm* appears to be a mistake that made its way into the text. It resembles *nekem*, the Dative form of the first person singular pronoun. That, however, would make two Datives in (ib), making the sentence ungrammatical. The context in (ia) makes it clear that the subject of the epistemic *must* is the third person singular Dative *neki*, which is coreferent with the *amaz* ‘other one’ demonstrative of the previous clause.

¹²One or two examples from each source.

- (42) *kÿ-k ÿgér-ÿk on magok-at ... megh fertezet-nÿ-e az teh zent*
 who-PL promise-3PL them self-ACC ... PRT violate-INF-3SG the your holy
new-ed-nek hajléék-a-t
 name-2SG-DAT house-POSS-ACC
 ‘who promise themselves to violate thy sanctuary’ (Székelyudvarhely C. 30r)
- (43) *megh fertezet-nÿe*
 PRT violate-INF
 ‘to violate’
- (44) *k-ic íger-ic maók-at ... még-ferteztèt-ni te nèu-èd-nc*
 who-PL promise-3PL self-ACC ... violate-INF your name-2SG-DAT
hailak-a-t
 house-POSS-ACC
 ‘who promise themselves to violate thy sanctuary’ (Vienna C. 30)

A. Jászó (1992: 422) speculates that the loss of the 3SG value of *-a/-e* was caused by the frequency of 3SG inflected infinitives. Among infinitives with a 3SG subject, uninflected infinitives outnumber agreeing infinitives by far. However, among all agreeing infinitives, those with a 3SG inflection are the most numerous. A. Jászó suggests that this may have played a role in the loss of the 3SG value and the amalgamation into *-ni/-ny/-nÿ*.

The approach of descriptive historical grammars outlined above does not strike me as very promising, however. Firstly, the claim that *-nia/-nya/nÿa/-nie/-nye/-nÿe* became a morphological alternative of *-ni/-ny/-nÿ* is simply not backed up by the data. While the uninflected infinitival suffix *-ni/-ny/-nÿ* could be followed by an agreement inflection (see many examples in section 2), this is not true for *-nia/-nya/nÿa/-nie/-nye/-nÿe*. That is, while we find minimal pairs like (45a) and (45b), examples like (46b) do not exist.

- (45) a. *Ne akar-y-atok ty ffel-ny*
 not want-IMP-2PL youPL afraid-INF
 ‘do not be afraid’ (Jordánszky C. 450)
- b. *ne akar-i-atok fel-n-etèc*
 not want-IMP-2PL fear-INF-2PL
 ‘do not be afraid’ (Munich C. 42ra)
- (46) a. *Ne akar-y-atok feel-ny-e*
 not want-IMP-2PL fear-INF-3SG
 ‘do not be afraid’ (Jordánszky C. 55)
- b. **ne akar-y-atok fel-nye-tec*
 not want-IMP-2PL fear-INF-2PL
 ‘do not be afraid’

At best, this shows that *-nia/-nya/nÿa/-nie/-nye/-nÿe* was an indeclinable infinitival suffix as opposed to the declinable *-ni/-ny/-nÿ*. Note, however, that affixes genuinely reanalyzed as part of their original host do not block further transparent affixation of the same type. Consider the affixation possibilities of the nominal compound *városháza* ‘city hall’, for instance. Historically (and to some degree even synchronically), *városháza* was a possessive construction comprising the possessor *város* ‘city’ and the possessum *ház* ‘house’ bearing the possessedness suffix *-a/-e/-ja/-je*.

- (47) *város-ház-a*
 city-house-POSS

‘city hall’

Synchronically, however, *városháza* ‘city hall’ is listed as a lexical unit; the *-a* in it has no morphemic status. Importantly, when *városháza* ‘city hall’ is a possessum, it obligatorily takes the transparent possessedness suffix, even though historically it already has such an affix:¹³

- (48) az ország legrégebb-i városházá-ja
the country oldest-ATTR city.hall-POSS
‘the country’s oldest city hall’

The indeclinability of *-nia/-nya/nja/-nie/-nye/nje* thus could not be derived from the putative fusion of the 3SG *-a/e* into the infinitival suffix *-ni*. It is more plausible that *-nia/-nya/nja/-nie/-nye/nje* cannot be followed by an agreement suffix because it is not a single suffix but a sequence of two suffixes: the regular infinitival ending *-ni/-ny/-nj* and a genuine 3SG agreement suffix *-a/e*.

Secondly, this analysis raises an issue about the status of the 3SG cell of the infinitival agreement paradigm. The whole paradigm is shown in (49) (with normalized orthography).

- | | | | | |
|------|----|-----------|----|-------------------------|
| (49) | a. | -(e/o/ö)m | d. | -unk/ünk |
| | | 1SG | | 1PL |
| | b. | -(e/o/ö)d | e. | -(e)tek/-(o)tok/-(ö)tök |
| | | 2SG | | 2PL |
| | c. | -a/e | f. | -(u/ü)k |
| | | 3SG | | 3PL |

If *-a/-e* was originally a 3SG inflection but it lost its status as an agreement marker, then the 3SG cell of the paradigm must have been replaced by a zero suffix.¹⁴ In Modern Hungarian, however, the 3SG infinitival agreement **is** *-a/-e*.

- (50) János-nak 8-ra a munkahely-é-n kell len-ni-e.
John-DAT 8-by the workplace-POSS-at have.to be-INF-3SG
‘John has to be at work by 8.’

The previous analyses thus must assume that after the early Middle Hungarian period the alternative *-nia/-nya/nja/-nie/-nye/nje* infinitival suffix was lost (as anti-agreement did not survive beyond this period) and at the same time the 3SG infinitival agreement changed from \emptyset back to the original *-a/-e*. This is a highly unappealing theory. It is much more plausible that the 3SG infinitival agreement has always been *-a/-e*, and OH *-nia/-nya/nja/-nie/-nye/nje* can be decomposed into two suffixes (infinitival ending+3SG agreement).¹⁵

¹³The lengthening of the last *a* to *á* is a regular morphophonological process in the language that need not concern us here.

¹⁴The alternative is that it was not replaced by a zero suffix, and 3SG subjects simply could not go together with inflected infinitives. This is unlikely, as all other subjects could co-occur with inflected infinitives.

¹⁵Károly (1956: 68) raises the possibility that OH has two different *-nia/-nya/nja/-nie/-nye/nje* endings. The one that co-occurs with a 3SG subject is decomposable into an infinitival marker and a 3SG agreement, while the one that appears in the anti-agreeing examples is an already fused, monomorphemic suffix. Thus for Károly, the infinitival 3SG inflection has remained *-a/e* throughout the history of Hungarian. The previous criticism, however, applies to this approach as well.

4 Infinitival anti-agreement in Modern Hungarian

OH infinitival anti-agreement has a small fossil in Modern Hungarian, too. As already mentioned before, agreeing infinitives in Modern Hungarian occur only in the presence of a Dative DP, so anti-agreeing infinitives are also found only in this context. (51a) and (51b) are representative of the Modern Hungarian facts. In (51a) the Dative DP is the overt subject of the infinitive (it features an inanimate noun, therefore it cannot be analyzed as a Dative experiencer in the matrix clause controlling a PRO infinitival subject), while in (51b) the Dative phrase fulfills the role of the experiencer in the main clause (*the boys* are the recipient of the obligation) and it controls a PRO subject in the infinitive.

- (51) a. Jövő év vég-é-re itt ház-ak-nak kell
 next year end-POSS-by here house-PL-DAT have.to
 épül-ni-ük/épül-ni-e.
 built-INF-3PL/built-INF-3SG
 ‘By the end of next year houses have to be built here.’ (Tóth 2000: 152)
- b. A fiú-k-nak ki kell vin-ni-ük/?vin-ni-e a szemet-et.
 the boy-PL-DAT out have.to take-INF-3PL/take-INF-3SG the garbage-ACC
 ‘The boys have to take out the garbage.’

Such examples are not acceptable for everybody, and those speakers that do not rule them out as ungrammatical often find them degraded compared to full agreement.

Modern Hungarian anti-agreement is subject to a strict constraint: it is possible only if the Dative noun phrase is headed by a lexical noun (see Tóth 2000; 2002, É. Kiss 2002, Rákosi & Laczkó 2008).¹⁶ Anti-agreement in the context of pronominal Dative noun phrases, whether the pronoun is first, second, or third person, is impossible. (52) and (53) minimally differ from (51a) and (51b) in that the former feature a 3PL Dative pronoun rather than a lexical noun.

- (52) Nekik át kell men-ni-ük/*men-ni-e a vizsgá-n, hiszen olyan sok-at
 they.DAT PRT have.to go-INF-3PL/go-INF-3SG the exam-on for so much-ACC
 készül-t-ek.
 study-PST-3PL
 ‘They have to pass the exam, for they have studied so much.’
- (53) Nekik ki kell vin-ni-ük/*vin-ni-e a szemet-et.
 they.DAT out have.to take-INF-3PL/take-INF-3SG the garbage-ACC
 ‘They have to take out the garbage.’

With the exception of É. Kiss (2002: ch. 9.4.3), data like (51) are mentioned in passing but not analyzed in the literature. É. Kiss argues that the Hungarian infinitival ending *-ni* is a nominalizing suffix, and so the infinitive is a nominal category. The Dative noun phrase in (51a) and (51b) occupies the position of the possessor. Since Hungarian lexical (but not pronominal) possessors are widely known to exhibit an anti-agreement effect (see Den Dikken 1999, Bartos 1999; 2000, É. Kiss 2002, Dékány 2011; to appear), É. Kiss suggests that what we see in (51a) and (51b) is none other than this well known phenomenon. The argument goes as follows.

Possessors in Hungarian may be either caseless or they may bear Dative case. Dative possessors may be extracted from the DP and function as external possessors. Possessa show agreement for the ϕ -features of pronominal possessors, while they do not agree with lexical possessors. There appears to be one exception to this generalization. With an external (hence

¹⁶Of course, for anti-agreement to arise, the lexical noun must be plural.

Dative) possessor headed by a plural lexical noun, the possessor may appear in two forms: without agreement, as in (54a), or with 3PL agreement (54b).¹⁷

- (54) a. A fiúk-nak eláz-ott a kalap-ja.
the boy-PL-DAT get.wet-PST3SG the hat-POSS
‘The boys’ hat got wet.’
b. A fiúk-nak eláz-ott a kalap-j-uk.
the boy-PL-DAT get.wet-PST.3SG the hat-POSS-3PL
‘The boys’ hat got wet.’

Given that lexical possessors do not trigger agreement, (54a) is expected but (54b) is to be explained.

Den Dikken (1999) argues that (54a) involves possessor extraction, while in (54b) the external possessor is generated in its surface position and is co-indexed with a DP-internal (plural) *pro* possessor. Possessa always agree with their pronominal possessor, so the possessum in (54b) also agrees with the *pro* possessor, producing the regular plural inflection. This analysis allows one to maintain the generalization that possessa agree only with pronominal possessors.

Den Dikken’s analysis derives the unexpected agreement with lexical possessors from a structure in which the lexical possessor is co-indexed with a pronoun. Building on this analysis, É. Kiss suggests that the unexpected 3SG agreement in (51a) and (51b) is also due to such a co-indexation structure. Recall that É. Kiss treats infinitives as nominal projections and the Dative subject is analyzed as a Dative possessor. She suggests that in the anti-agreeing cases in (51), the Dative DP is generated as a hanging topic (i.e. as an external possessor), and it is co-indexed with a lower *pro* element. The agreement is triggered by this *pro* (which is presumably a 3SG pronoun, as it produces 3SG agreement). In essence, in this analysis there is no genuine infinitival anti-agreement: the relevant data are shown to instantiate possessive structures and exhibit the independently attested and motivated possessive anti-agreement.

It is not my intention to argue for or against this analysis of the Modern Hungarian facts. What I would like to point out, however, is that this analysis cannot extend to the OH anti-agreement data (which, to be fair, it was never intended to do). This analysis crucially rests on the fact that in Modern Hungarian anti-agreement is attested only with Dative noun phrases headed by a lexical 3PL noun in both possessive structures and infinitives. In OH, as we have seen, infinitival anti-agreement is not restricted to clauses that contain a Dative noun phrase. Subject, object, and Ablative control as well as ECM and raising structures also admit anti-agreeing infinitives. Furthermore, OH infinitival anti-agreement is attested with pronominal subjects, but OH has no possessive anti-agreement with pronominal possessors (possessa must show full agreement for pronominal possessors). Infinitival anti-agreement thus must be a different phenomenon in Modern and Old Hungarian: the former may plausibly be assimilated to possessive anti-agreement, while the latter cannot.¹⁸

¹⁷This is an option only if the possessor is external. Lexical possessors that are internal to the possessum’s DP projection cannot trigger agreement.

¹⁸At first sight, the Slavonia and the Szigetköz dialects of Hungarian appear to have used OH-style anti-agreeing infinitives at least up to the early 20th century. On closer inspection, however, it turns out that the data from these dialects are unlikely to involve anti-agreement.

In the Slavonia dialect infinitives that may be suspected of featuring anti-agreement involve the *-a* ending. While in the standard dialect (the 3SG) *a* combines with the infinitival suffix without further ado (i), the Slavonia dialect employs a hiatus-filling *j* (ii).

5 3SG as default agreement

Descriptive grammars are unable to analyze *-a/e* as the 3SG inflection with non-3SG subjects because they are unaware of the existence of anti-agreement effects in other languages. In certain languages and under specific circumstances, regular ϕ -feature agreement on the verb is altered, and the verb bears an invariable inflection. This invariable inflection is either a special affix or the 3SG agreement marker across the board (i.e. with non-3SG subjects, too). Verbs in Kinande, for instance, cannot feature regular agreement with *wh*- subjects. Such subjects trigger the special agreement *u*- instead of the regular *a*-.

- (55) a. Kambale a-langIra Marya.
K. AGR-saw Mary
Kambale saw Mary. (Schneider-Zioga 2000: ex. 1a)
- b. *IyOndI yO a-langIra Marya?
who that AGR-saw Mary (Schneider-Zioga 2000: ex. 1c)
- c. IyOndI yO u-langIra Marya?
who that WH.AGR-saw Mary
'Who saw Mary?' (Schneider-Zioga 2000: ex. 1d)

(i) lát-ni-a
see-INF-3SG
for him to see (standard dialect)

(ii) lát-ni-jä
see-INF-ja
for him to see (Slavonia dialect)
(Balassa 1894: 263)

Infinitives may be inflected with *-nijä* even when the subject is non-3SG (see Szarvas 1876: 62, Simonyi 1892: 290, Balassa 1894: 263, and Keresztes 1953: 341):

- (iii) Ázok tun-äk dānol-ni-jä.
those could-3PL sing-INF-ja
They could sing. (Balassa 1894: 263)

As pointed out by Balassa (1894), however, the *-nijä* ending appears even in those cases in which vowel harmony would require the *-nije* allomorph of the 3SG person inflection (iv). He concludes that the *a* in (iii) and (iv) is not a person inflection, and claims that this *a* is the distal demonstrative, which fused into the infinitival ending. While he does not present any evidence for the latter conjecture, the lack of vowel harmony in (iv) convincingly shows that we are not dealing with a person inflection here.

- (iv) a. Gyere be ë-ni-jä.
come.SBJ.2SG in eat-INF-ja
Come in to eat. (Balassa 1894: 263)
- b. Mágunk szokâ-jok âz-tât tē-ni-jä.
ourselves habitually.do-1PL that-ACC do-INF-ja
We (habitually) do that ourselves. (Balassa 1894: 263)

In the Szigetköz dialect the *n* of the infinitival suffix is palatalized, so the suffix is used in the *-nyi* form. There are also infinitives ending in *-nya*, as in (v). The *-a* of these forms might be taken to be a 3SG ending. When infinitives like (v) have a non-3SG subject, we appear to have an anti-agreeing infinitive.

- (v) innya, ir-nya
drink.inf write-inf
to drink, to write (Szabó 1907: 22)

However, the *-a* of (v) cannot be plausibly analyzed as a 3SG ending, as its appearance is conditioned by the verb. Specifically, *-nya* is possible only with a subset of monosyllabic verbs whose stem vowel is *i/ɨ* (Szabó 1907: 22). We can thus conclude that the *-nya* forms with non-3SG subjects are uninflected infinitives with a special infinitival allomorph rather than anti-agreeing infinitives.

Imbabura Quechua verbs can show regular agreement only with Nominative subjects. Experiencer subjects bear Accusative case, however, so they cannot induce regular agreement on the verb. In this case the verb bears 3SG agreement regardless of the ϕ -features of the subject.

- (56) Juzi-ta puñu-naya-n.
 José-ACC sleep-DESID-3S
 ‘José wants to sleep; José is sleepy.’ (Baker 2008a: 241)
- (57) ñuka-ta puñu-naya-n (*puñu-naya-ni).
 I-ACC sleep-DESID-3S sleep-DESID-1sS
 ‘I want to sleep; I am sleepy.’ (Baker 2008a: 243)

Once the existence of such phenomena, and especially the type of agreement in (57), is taken into consideration, there is no impediment to analyzing OH *-nia/-nya/njä/-nie/-nye/-ñje* as two morphemes, the regular infinitival suffix *-ni/-ny/-nj* and the regular 3SG inflection *-a/-e*, with non-3SG subjects, too. I submit that this is indeed the correct analysis of OH infinitival agreement mismatches: the relevant examples feature a genuine 3SG inflection. This approach avoids both problems raised by the descriptivist alternative discussed above. It gives a natural account of the fact that *-nia/-nya/njä/-nie/-nye/-ñje* is never followed by an inflection (it is already inflected), and does not require the implausible reanalysis of the 3SG ending from *-a/e* to \emptyset and back to *-a/e*. This gives the present analysis a significant advantage over the alternatives.

I suggest that the 3SG inflection with non-3SG subjects in OH is a default ending. Among number values, singular is less marked than plural. Rooryck (2003), López (2008), Farkas & de Swart (2010) and Nevins (2011), among others, argue that plural is a privative syntactic feature, while singular is simply lack of number. This means that NumP is projected only in non-singular noun phrases. Among person features, third person is less marked than either first or second person. Ionin & Matushansky (2002), for example, argue that third person corresponds to the feature [+person], second person corresponds to the feature matrix [+person, +participant], and first person has the feature matrix [+person, +participant, +speaker]. In their analysis, the features of 3rd person are thus a proper subset of the features of both second and first person. A different line of research, in particular Benveniste (1971), Sigurðsson (2000), López (2008) and Harley & Ritter (2002a;b), argues that person features are associated only to second and first person, and third person is actually lack of person.¹⁹ Whether third person is a person feature or not, everybody is agreed that third person is less marked than second or first person. 3SG is thus the least marked feature combination possible, and so it is the most suitable to surface as a default inflection (see also López 2008).

6 Speculations on the distribution of default agreement

As we have seen in section 2, all the anti-agreeing infinitives in my database instantiate control, raising, or ECM structures, and there are no anti-agreeing infinitives with a referentially independent (Dative) subject. The question that naturally arises here is whether this is a genuine or an accidental gap in the data. That is, were infinitives with a ϕ -feature independent subject able to anti-agree or not?

This is a well known problem of working with corpora, of course: the researcher does not necessarily know whether data that do not occur instantiate an accidental gap or they are

¹⁹See Nevins (2007) and Nevins (2011) for arguments that third person has a feature specification, and Den Dikken (2013) for a rebuttal.

missing from the corpus because they are ungrammatical. If the corpus is big enough and the structure in which the data of interest could potentially occur are frequent enough, then it is reasonable to conclude that the relevant data are missing because they are ungrammatical.

This is not the case with anti-agreeing infinitives with a referentially independent subject, however. As already mentioned before, predicates that take an infinitive with a ϕ -feature independent subject are much less frequent in the codices than predicates that take control, raising, or ECM infinitives. Furthermore, anti-agreement itself is optional and relatively infrequent even in those structures in which it definitely can occur: in control, raising, and ECM infinitives it is in free variation with uninflected and agreeing infinitives and is by far the least frequent of the three options. Since both infinitives with a referentially independent subject and anti-agreeing infinitives have a low frequency, their combination may simply constitute an accidental gap.

On the other hand, if the gap in the data is real, and anti-agreement is not possible in OH with infinitives that have a referentially independent subject, then we must ask what the common property of control, raising, and ECM is that allows anti-agreement to arise. The analysis of control has for some time now been a battleground of the Agree based PRO analysis (Landau 2000; 2003; 2004; 2006; 2008) and the movement analysis (Boeckx & Hornstein 2003; 2004; 2006a;b, Boeckx et al. 2010, Hornstein & Polinsky 2010). The structure of ECM infinitives also remains controversial: the Accusative nominal is taken either to get case from the matrix verb in the infinitival subject position (Chomsky 1981), or to raise to the matrix object position (Postal 1974, Lasnik & Saito 1991, Bošković 2002, Runner 2006).

Subject-to-subject raising, the movement analysis of control and the raising to object analysis of ECM all involve A-movement. The referentially independent Dative subject of the infinitive, on the other hand, certainly does not move out of the infinitival clause. It is possible, then, that the movement of the infinitive's subject makes it possible for anti-agreement to arise. Anti-agreement in the Bantu languages is certainly related to movement. In these languages anti-agreement arises in subject interrogatives: *wh*- subjects move out of the canonical subject position, which prevents the finite verb from agreeing with them (see (55)). This, however, is A-bar movement, and it remains to be seen if anti-agreement could also plausibly be caused by the A-movement of subjects. It also remains to be seen why anti-agreement is obligatory in the Bantu case but optional in OH infinitives.

7 Conclusion

This paper has shown that Old Hungarian features anti-agreement on infinitives. In the data accessible to me, anti-agreement occurs in control, raising and ECM infinitives but not in infinitives with a referentially independent Dative subject. In those contexts where anti-agreement can occur, it is in free variation with agreeing and uninflected infinitives. Anti-agreement thus appears to be optional, and it is also less frequent than the other two alternatives.

Previous treatments of OH infinitival anti-agreement suggest that the relevant data do not instantiate anti-agreement. They treat the *-nia/nya/nja/nie/nye/nje* ending that occurs with non-3SG subjects as a monomorphemic suffix, claiming that *-a/e* has lost its status as a 3SG agreement marker and fused into the infinitival ending. I have shown the weaknesses of this approach and argued that the relevant cases involve genuine 3SG inflection with a non-3SG subject as a result of default agreement.

I also speculated that if OH infinitival anti-agreement is indeed only possible in control, raising and ECM infinitives, then the default agreement might be triggered by movement. Subject-to-subject raising infinitives definitely involve movement, control and ECM both have movement analyses, while referentially independent Dative subjects do not move out of the

subject position of the infinitival clause.

8 Primary sources

Cornides Codex

1514–1519. András Bognár and Ferenc Levárdy (eds.), *Cornides kódex*. Facsimile, and critical edition. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1967.

Döbrentei Codex

1508. Csilla Abaffy, Csilla T. Szabó, and Edit Madas (eds.), *Döbrentei-kódex*. Halábori Bertalan keze írásával. Facsimile, transcription of the original record, with introduction and notes. Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó–Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, 1995.

Festetics Codex

Before 1494. Csilla Abaffy (ed.), *Festetics-kódex*. (Facsimile, transcription of the original record, with introduction and notes) Budapest: Argumentum, Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság. 1996.

Funeral Sermon and Prayer

1192–1195. In *Régi magyar nyelvemlékek*, ed. by Adrienne Dömötör. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 2006. 27.

Gömöri Codex

1516. Lea Haader and Zsuzsanna Papp (eds.), *Gömöry-kódex*. (Facsimile and transcription of the original record) Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet. 2001.

Guary Codex

Before 1495. Dénes Szabó (ed.), *Guary-kódex*. Budapest, 1944.

Jókai Codex

C. 1440. János P. Balázs (ed.), *Jókai-kódex*. (Transcription of the original record and its latin equivalent with introduction and notes) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 1981.

Jordánszky Codex

1516–1519. *A Jordánszky-kódex bibliafordítása*. Printed by Ferenc Toldy. Introduction by György Volf. 1888.

Horvát Codex

1522. Lea Haader and Zsuzsanna Papp (eds.), *Horvát-kódex*. Facsimile, transcription of the original record, with introduction and notes. Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, 1994.

Kazinczy Codex

1526–1541. Zsuzsa Kovács (ed.), *Kazinczy-kódex*. Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, 2003.

Könyvecse (= Könyvecse az szent apostoloknak méltóságokról)

1521. István Pusztai (ed.), *Könyvecse az szent apostoloknak méltóságokról*. (Facsimile, transcription of the original record, with introduction and notes) Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság. 1985.

Miskolc Fragment

1525. Zsuzsanna Papp and Zsuzsa Kovács (eds.), *Vitkovics-kódex és Miskolci töredék*. Facsimile, transcription of the original record, with notes. Budapest: MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet, 1991.

Munich Codex

1466. Antal Nyíri (ed.), *A Münchener kódex 1466-ból*. (Transcription of the original record and its latin equivalent) Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 1971.

Soproni Virágének

around 1490. In *Magyar nyelvemlékek*, ed. by József Molnár and Györgyi Simon. Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó. 1977. 107.

Székelyudvarhely Codex

1526-1528. Csilla N. Abaffy (ed.), *Székelyudvarhelyi kódex* (Facsimile and transcription of the original record with notes). Budapest: Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság. 1993.

Teleki Codex

1525-1531. György Volf (ed.), *Döbrentei codex. Teleki codex*. Budapest: A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvkiadó Hivatala. 1884.

Vienna Codex

Mid-15th c. Gedeon Mészöly (ed.), *Bécsi kódex*. Budapest: MTA. 1926.

Winkler Codex

1506. István Pusztai (ed.), *Winkler-kódex*. Facsimile, transcription of the original record, with introduction and notes. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988.

Hivatkozások

- A. Jászó, Anna. 1992. Az igenevek [Non-finite verbs]. In Loránd Benkő, E. Abaffy Erzsébet & Rácz Endre (eds.), *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana II/1. A kései ómagyar kor morfológiája. [A historical grammar of Hungarian. Volume II/1.]*, 411–454. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Baker, Mark. 2008a. *The syntax of agreement and concord*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Mark C. 2008b. On the nature of the anti-agreement effect: evidence from wh-in-situ in Ibibio. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39(4). 615–632.
- Balassa, József. 1894. A szlavóniai nyelvjárás [The Slavonian dialect]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 23. 259–267.
- Bartos, Huba. 1999. *Morfoszintaxis és interpretáció. A magyar inflexiós jelenségek szintaktikai háttere. [Morphosyntax and interpretation. The syntactic background of Hungarian inflexional phenomena]*. Budapest: Eötvös University dissertation.
- Bartos, Huba. 2000. Az inflexiós jelenségek szintaktikai háttere [The syntactic background of inflexional phenomena]. In Ferenc Kiefer (ed.), *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan 3. Morfológia. [Hungarian structural grammar 3. Morphology]*, 653–761. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1971. *Problems in general linguistics*. Miami: University of Miami Press.
- Boeckx, Cedric & Norbert Hornstein. 2003. Reply to "Control is not movement". *Linguistic Inquiry* 34. 269–280.
- Boeckx, Cedric & Norbert Hornstein. 2004. Movement under control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35. 431–452.
- Boeckx, Cedric & Norbert Hornstein. 2006a. Control in Icelandic and theories of control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37. 591–606.

- Boeckx, Cedric & Norbert Hornstein. 2006b. The virtues of control as movement. *Syntax* 9. 118–130.
- Boeckx, Cedric, Norbert Hornstein & Jairo Nunes. 2010. Icelandic control really is A-movement: reply to Bobaljik and Landau. *Linguistic Inquiry* 41(1). 111–130.
- Bošković, Željko. 2002. A-movement and the epp. *Syntax* 5(3). 167–218.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding: the Pisa lectures* Studies in generative grammar 9. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Dékány, Éva. 2011. *A profile of the Hungarian DP. The interaction of lexicalization, agreement and linearization with the functional sequence*. Tromsø: University of Tromsø dissertation.
- Dékány, Éva. to appear. The syntax of anaphoric possessives in Hungarian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 1999. On the structural representation of possession and agreement. The case of (anti-)agreement in Hungarian possessed Nominal Phrases. In István Kenesei (ed.), *Crossing boundaries: Theoretical Advances in Central and Eastern European Languages*, 137–178. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dikken, Marcel den. 2013. Phi-features. Handout of the Morphology seminar held at CUNY Graduate Center, Fall 2013.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elouazizi, Noureddine. 2005. Anti-agreement effects as (anti)-connectivity. In John Alderete (ed.), *Proceedings of 24th WCCFL*, 120–128. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla.
- Farkas, Donka F. & Henriëtte de Swart. 2010. The semantics and pragmatics of plurals. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 3. 1–54.
- Harley, Heidi & Elizabeth Ritter. 2002a. Person and number in pronouns: a feature-geometric analysis. *Language* 78(3). 482–526.
- Harley, Heidi & Elizabeth Ritter. 2002b. Structuring the bundle: A universal morphosyntactic feature geometry. In Heike Wiese & Horst J. Simon (eds.), *Pronouns*, 23–39. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hornstein, Norbert & Maria Polinsky (eds.). 2010. *Movement theory of control*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ionin, Tania & Ora Matushansky. 2002. DPs with a twist: a unified analysis of Russian comitatives. In Browne Wayles, Ji-Yung Kim, Barbara H. Partee & Robert A. Rothstein (eds.), *Proceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 11: the Amherst meeting 2002*, 255–274. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications. <http://www-ref.usc.edu/ionin/MyDownloads>.
- Jones, Michael Allan. 1993. *Sardinian syntax*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Károly, Sándor. 1956. *Igenévrendszereiünk a kódexirodalom első szakaszában [The system of non-finite forms in the early codices]* Nyelvtudományi értekezések 10. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Keresztes, Kálmán. 1953. A személyragos főnévi igenév használatáról [On the use of the inflected infinitive]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 77. 340–352.
- Landau, Idan. 2000. *Elements of control: structure and meaning in infinitival constructions* Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 51. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Landau, Idan. 2003. Movement out of control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34. 471–498.
- Landau, Idan. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22. 811–877.
- Landau, Idan. 2006. Severing the distribution of PRO from case. *Syntax* 9. 153–170.
- Landau, Idan. 2008. Two routes of control: evidence from case transmission in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26. 877–924.
- Lasnik, Howard & Mamoru Saito. 1991. On the subject of infinitives. In Lise Dobrin, Lynn

- Nichols & Rosa Rodriguez (eds.), *Papers from the twenty-seventh regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 324–343. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Longa, Víctor Manuel. 1994. The Galician inflected infinitive and the theory of UG. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 4(1). 23–44.
- López, Luis. 2008. The [person] restriction: why? and, most specially, why not? In Roberta D'Alessandro, Susan Fischer & Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (eds.), *Agreement restrictions* Interface explorations 15, 129–158. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Miller, Gary D. 2003. Where do conjugated infinitives come from? *Diachronica* 20(1). 45–81.
- Miller, Gary D. 2004. The origin of the Welsh conjugated infinitive. *Diachronica* 21(2). 329–350.
- Modesto, Marcello. 2007. Inflected infinitives in Brazilian Portuguese as an argument both contra and in favor of a movement analysis of control. *Revista Letras* 72. 297–309.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2007. The representation of third person and its consequences for person-case effects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25(2). 273–313.
- Nevins, Andrew. 2011. Multiple agree with clitics: person complementarity vs. omnivorous number. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29(4). 939–971.
- Ouali, Hamid. 2008. On C-to-T transfer: the nature of agreement and anti-agreement in Berber. In Roberta D'Alessandro, Susann Fischer & Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson (eds.), *Agreement restrictions*, 159–180. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ouhalla, Jamal. 1993. Subject-extraction, negation and the anti-agreement effect. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11. 477–518.
- Ouhalla, Jamal. 2005. Agreement features, agreement and anti-agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23(3). 655–686.
- Pires, Acrisio. 2001. Clausal and TP-defective gerunds: control without Tense. In Kim M. & U. Strauss (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 31*, 386–406. Massachusetts, Amherst: GLSA.
- Pires, Acrisio. 2006. *The Minimalist syntax of defective domains: gerunds and infinitives* Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 98. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Postal, Paul. 1974. *On raising: an inquiry into one rule of English grammar and its theoretical implications* Current Studies in Linguistics series. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rákosi, György & Tibor Laczkó. 2008. On the categorial status of agreement-marked infinitives in Hungarian. In Christopher Piñón & Szentgyörgyi Szilárd (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian*, 149–172. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Raposo, Eduardo. 1987. Case theory and Infl-to-Comp: the inflected infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18. 85–109.
- Richards, Norvin. 2001. *Movement in language. Interactions and architectures* Oxford linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rooryck, Johan. 2003. The morphosyntactic structure of articles and pronouns in Dutch. In Jan Koster & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Germania et alia: A linguistic webschrift for Hans den Besten*, 1–12. Groningen: University of Groningen. <http://odur.let.rug.nl/~koster/DenBesten/Rooryck.pdf>.
- Runner, Jeffrey. 2006. Lingering challenges to the raising-to-object and object-control constructions. *Syntax* 9. 193–213.
- Schneider-Zioga, Patricia. 2000. Anti-agreement and the fine structure of the left edge. *University of California Irvine Working Papers in Linguistics* 6.
- Schneider-Zioga, Patricia. 2007. Anti-agreement, anti-locality and minimality: the syntax of dislocated subjects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25. 403–446.
- Scida, Emily. 2004. *The inflected infinitive in Romance languages* Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics. New York: Routledge.

- Sigurðsson, H. Ármann. 2000. The locus of case and agreement. *Working papers in Scandinavian syntax* 65. 65–108.
- Simon, Eszter & Bálint Sass. 2012. Nyelvtechnológia és kulturális örökség, avagy korpuszpépítés ómagyar kódexekből [Language technology and cultural heritage: building corpora from Old Hungarian codices]. *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok* 24. 243–264.
- Simonyi, Zsigmond. 1892. *A magyar határozók [Adverbs in Hungarian]*, vol. 2. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Szabó, Sándor. 1907. *A szigetközi nyelvjárás [The Szigetköz dialect]*. Athaeneum.
- Szarvas, Gábor. 1876. A Slavoniai tájszólás II [The Slavonian dialect II]. *Magyar Nyelvőr* 5. 61–65.
- Tóth, Ildikó. 2000. *Inflected infinitives in Hungarian*: University of Tilburg dissertation.
- Tóth, Ildikó. 2002. Can the Hungarian infinitive be possessed? In István Kenesei & Péter Siptár (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian* 8, 134–160. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Tóth, Ildikó. 2011. A ragozott főnévi igenevek a kései ómagyar korban [Inflected infinitives in Late Old Hungarian]. In Marianne Bakró-Nagy & Forgács Tamás (eds.), *A nyelvtörténeti kutatások legújabb eredményei VI [The newest result of diachronic research VI]*, 249–265. Szeged: SZTE.