Csilla Ilona Dér

Why and what to teach about grammaticalization in Hungarian?

1. Introduction

Grammaticalization is one of the major topics in contemporary linguistics, which fact is well represented by the numerous volumes[1] and conferences [2]addressing this particular language change. It is being investigated by functional and by formal-generative linguists, regardless of whether they describe it as a distinct language change, or not – we probably can't find any historical linguist who hasn't got her/his opinion about grammaticalization. And as a matter of course grammaticalization is also an unavoidable subject in historical linguistics courses.[3]

Grammaticalization lends itself particularly well to make acquainted with different theoretical positions and with problems of language theory, since several aspects of it is under continuous discussion. These polemies and critics provide a proper and, none-theless, more interesting context for teaching the related topics in the linguistic courses.

This study briefly presents some of the current theoretical problems in grammaticalization research, the difficulties we have to face when describing grammaticalization processes in Hungarian, and the possible answers we can give to these questions. I'm going to present these topics in interconnection with the topic of teaching

---

[1] E. g. López-Couso; Seoane; Fanego 2008a, b; Detges, Ulrich; Waltereit, Richard 2008; Eythórsson, Thórdallur 2008, Davidse; Vandelanotte; Cuyckens.

[2] E. g. New Reflections on Grammaticalization 1–4, Current Trends in Grammaticalization 2009, International Conference on Grammaticalization and (Inter)Subjectification 2010.

[3] My observations concerning the topic of teaching linguistics are based on my own university courses about grammaticalization and language history.

language history at the university, also sketching out the why and how of communicating these questions in the linguistic courses.

2. Possible diachronic readings of grammaticalization

The first very important question is the following: what kind of language change do we present as grammaticalization? The concept has at least two different diachronic intepretations: those who consider it in a broader sense, grammaticalization is, in Haspelmath's formulation[4], »the gradual drift in all parts of the grammar toward tighter structures, toward less freedom in the use of linguistic expressions at all levels.« According to this approach the evolution of all grammatical items (function words, suffixes) and functions passes through grammaticalization, therefore grammaticalization means ›becoming (more) grammatical‹, a shift from a lexical unit to a grammatical one[5].

There also exist several narrower interpretations one of which considers grammaticalization a process where grammatical morphemes evolve from lexems. Here belongs the classical notion of grammaticalization that approaches this change as agglutination: the former lexem loses its independency, attaches to the preceding or following word stem and becomes an affix. We can find numerous examples in Hungarian for this process: most adverbial noun-suffixes[6] emerged from nouns with primary inflectional endsuffix[7]: -

---

[4] Haspelmath 1998, 318.

[5] E. g. Hungarian authors like D. Mátai 2007.

[6] Noun-suffix means here that the suffix attaches to noun stems.

[7] Inflectional endsuffix: Hungarian literature distinguishes two kinds of inflectional suffixes, *jel* and *rag.* I use for them the expression inflectional marker (›jel‹) and inflectional endsuffix (›rag‹). They differ from each other, among other things, in position: inflectional markers usually take the inner position in the word, they come after the stem or the derivational affix; inflectional endsuffixes can take closing position. A further difference is how many of them can occur in one word: there can be more than one inflectional marker in one word, but only one inflectional endsuffix*,* e. g. in *házaimat* ›my houses (accusative)‹ possessive *-ai* expresses more than one

ba/-be ›(illative) in(to)‹*, -ban/-ben* ›(inessive) in‹ and *-ból/-ből* ›(elative) out from, out of‹ originates in word *bél* ›inner part‹ with different adverbial primary noun-suffixes (e. g. *belen*).

Another type of the narrower approaches of grammaticalization could be regarding it as a distinct language change. I prefer this point of view, because the broader interpretation is not very useful for the empirical research. There are several ways in the world's languages how linguistic units can reach a more grammatical status (for the detailed description, see below), therefore the statement »it became more grammatical« says nothing about the character of the change itself. In this case, grammaticalization is only a label which only tells us the direction of the process (just like »degrammaticalization« marks out the opposite direction: grammatical unit > more lexical unit). But the nature of the language change is crucial, and direction is only one aspect of it. The consequences of the broader perspective also affect the theory: some linguists, mostly from the generative camp, concerns grammaticalization as an epiphenomenon, something that doesn't really exist, because it can be reduced to different language processes (or is a result of those), namely, semantic changes, phonological changes and reanalysis[8].

We can reject these accusations by proving that the order and form of the processes which work in grammaticalization is not arbitrary, but they show a particular chronology and correlation. Another solution would be an attempt to separate grammaticalization from other language changes that also result in (more) grammatical elements. These two approaches don't exclude each other, in fact, the latter supports the former. Showing the aformentioned differences between interpretations of grammaticalization we're going to be able to show the students how relevant the precise definition of the various language changes is and why we should limit their scope. It also is useful when we try to classify language changes into types (see below).

---

property and *-m* is the possessive ending in Sg. 1., both of them are *inflectional markers*, *-t* is the endsuffix.
[8] e. g. Newmeyer 2001, Joseph 2001.

Concerning grammaticalization processes some scholars use the notion of primary and secondary grammaticalization[9]. We speak of primary grammaticalization if a non-grammatical (lexical) unit becomes grammatical, and of secondary grammaticalization if a linguistic unit, which is already grammatical, grammaticalizes further into a more grammatical unit. This partition of grammaticalization is not without any problems, because it does not tell us that until which point we are dealing with primary grammaticalization, and what other criteria it has to meet besides meaning change. In case of grammaticalization we can count on at least three characteristic mechanisms operating on the meaning, the structure and the surface of the grammaticalizing form: 1. meaning change (acquiring grammatical meaning), 2. reanalysis[10] (reordering of structure, we see change in category[11]), and 3. phonological reduction (and sometimes fusion). We can illustrate this with the evolution of the Hungarian inflectional noun-suffix *-szor/-szer/-ször*, expressing multiplicativus[12]:

Meaning change (Old Hungarian period): the source was the inflected noun *szeren ~ szert* (*szër* ›line, row, order, mode‹ + locative endsuffix *-n* or *-t* ›at, in‹) in locative function, later expressing time (e. g. *előszeren* ›first in the line‹ > ›at first, the first time‹). The suffix was presumably analogically transferred from nouns to numeral stems and there it took up the multiplicative meaning.

---

[9] Givón 1991, Traugott 2002, etc.

[10] Reanalysis »is a change in underlying structure that does not exhibit any change surface structure. The reanalysis does not replace the former structure, but produces a second analysis side by side with it, referred to as a multiple analysis approach« (McDaniels 2003, 81–82 after Harris, Campbell 1995).

[11] Under »change in category« I mean that a linguistic unit shifts from a category into another one. I use the term not only for word classes, because grammaticalization works not only in main word classes, as we notice, for instance, change in category in the case of postpositions becoming noun-suffixes. This change can be connected to reanalysis: actually, change in category is the result of reanalysis.

[12] For further details see Korompay 1992, 361–363.

Reanalysis and change in category: noun with adverbial inflectional endsuffix > postposition > inflectional endsuffix

Phonological reduction: when the item *szert* became more frequent and because of the repression of locative *–t*, the suffix disappeared: *szer*. The result was the same when the disyllabic *szeren* turned into one syllable. In contemporary usage and in some dialects we can observe more reduced forms of the suffix in all variants: *-szó ~ -szo; -ső ~ -szö; -sze.*

Hungarian language shows several interesting features of grammaticalization: with the exception of affixes, phonological reduction was very rare, it occured in the earliest group of verbal prefixes (e. g. *belé > be ~ be* ›into‹) and in case of some modal words and particles (e. g. *találom* ›I find‹ *> talám > talán > tán* ›maybe, perhaps‹*, látom* ›I see‹ *> lám* ›well‹). In most grammaticalization changes we don't find phonological reduction at all. We have to accentuate this fact when we teach about these changes in historical linguistic courses. The realizations of grammaticalization processes in different languages have their theoretical consequences and may lead to problems related to the status of the phenomenon.

The question is now that what we can do with those linguistic units the grammaticalization of which doesn't involve any phonological reduction and reanalysis, only modification in functions? In primary grammaticalization we can observe a typical chronology and correlation between semantic changes, reanalysis and phonological reduction (if there is one),[13] but this is not always the case in secondary grammaticalization. On the one hand, we have to show students that grammaticalization has its own features, that is why we can treat it as a distinct language change; on the other hand, we have to underline that these features can vary in the world's languages, but they not necessarily do and not in all

---

[13] As far as we know grammaticalization processes begin with semantical and not with formal modification, the former precedes the latter. There are also correlations between the mechanisms: »A number of semantic, syntactic and phonological processes interact in the grammaticalization of morphemes and of whole constructions« (Lehmann 1982, vii, cf. Haspelmath 2004, 26).

features. We must also emphasize at this point that on the basis of purely theoretical considerations (e. g. as a consequence of a particular language theory, see the generative interpretation of grammaticalization) we can't simplify a complex phenomenon, as far as we don't explain sufficiently the aforementioned special features. Here we can also discuss with the students the validity scope of different theoretical approaches.

Another topic we have to talk about concerning grammaticalization is change in category. It raised no problem for the classical interpretation, because when a lexical unit turns into a grammatical unit, change of category always takes place. If we introduce the notion of primary and secondary grammaticalization, however, we see a more complex, and even confusing, picture:

Change in category:
  primary grammaticalization:
    - non-grammatical unit > grammatical unit
  secondary grammaticalization:
    - grammatical unit (function word) > grammatical unit (affix), e. g. postposition > adverbial noun-suffix; verb > modal word; adverbial participle > postposition
    - grammatical unit (affix) > grammatical unit (new[14] type of suffix), e. g. derivational affix > inflectional marker; derivational suffix > inflectional endsuffix; inflectional marker > inflectional endsuffix

No change in category:
  secondary grammaticalization:
    - grammatical unit > grammatical unit (new type of suffix), e. g. personal possessive suffix Pl. 3.> determiner inflectional marker (-*ik*)
    - gaining new grammatical functions, e. g. -*nak/-nek*: lative > dative > genitive

---

[14] »New« means here new item in the category, not new category.

The theoretical consequences are significant here, because one can raise the question: can we speak of a distinct type of language change in case of grammaticalization, if primary and secondary grammaticalization present such differences, and if, in secondary grammaticalization, change in category is not always present, and we can notice change only in function(s), instead? We may find the answer by showing students the importance of scale in grammaticalization and in other language changes: if we look at the whole process, we can only interpret secondary grammaticalization together with primary grammaticalization, or with changes which can yield grammatical units. Therefore, there exists no linguistic unit in the world's languages that has gone through secondary grammaticalization without firstly becoming more grammatical, mostly through primary grammaticalization. This concerns even degrammaticalization processes, namely, when a (more) grammatical unit becomes less grammatical, because more grammatical items must have undergone through changes that made it more grammatical[15]. Consequently, secondary grammaticalization has no sense *per se*, but it constitutes a specific period of grammaticalization or of the evolution of grammatical forms.

3. Grammaticalization and other language changes

Besides grammaticalization we have to deal with other processes which result in (more) grammatical units. The following list consists of the most important language changes that work(ed) in the language history of Hungarian:[16]

    Conversion (change in word-class): lexical word-class becomes function word, e. g. noun with adverbial endsuffix > postposition (e. g. *vmi után* ›after sg‹); adverb > verbal prefix (e. g. *össze* ›together‹).

    Reanalysis (definition see above): e. g. conjunction/connective (e. g. *úgy, hogy > úgyhogy* ›so, so that‹.

---

[15] cf. Dér 2008a.

[16] Other languages chose various processes (changes) to create grammatical elements, some of them are common, some of them not, see Lindström 2005, 414–415.

Fossilization of suffixes or components: »a formerly productive formative is reanalyzed as part of a root« (Himmelmann 2004, 27), e. g. verbal prefixes (e. g. *agyon* ›to brain‹ < *agy* ›brain‹ + *-on* ›(superessive) on, at‹, see *üt* ›hit‹ vs. *agyonüt* ›to kill‹; *tönkre* ›to ruin‹ > *tönk* ›stump‹ + *-re* ›(sublative) on, by‹, see *tesz* ›do‹ *tönkretesz* ›to bring to ruin‹.

Exaptation: using linguistic elements without any function for new functions (differs from change in function, because, in this case, there exists a period when the element had no function cat all), e. g. verbal and nominal derivational suffixes: *moccan* ›to budge‹, *éne**k*** ›song‹.

Corpulenting: the primary inflectional endsuffix attaches to the preceding thematic vowel, e. g. *-on/-en/-ön* ›(superessive) on, at‹, see *házon* ›on the house‹; *-an/-en* ›(essive) –ly‹, see *szépen* ›beautifully‹. Both of them evolved from primary locative suffix *-n*. This change is more common among derivational suffixes, for instance: frequentative *-od/-ed/-öd* (e. g. *bököd* ›to stab‹) and inchoative *-ad/-ed* (pl. *lázad* ›to riot‹), both originate from the derivational suffix *-d*.

Accumulation of inflectional endsuffixes: two suffixes join and gain new function: terminative *-ig* from lative *-Ç* and *-k,* see *keddig* ›til Tuesday‹.

Bushing[17] of derivational suffixes: attachment of derivational suffixes with the same or different function; this process goes typically hand in hand with corpulenting, e. g. *-dalom/-delem* in *lakodalom* ›bridal‹.

Some of these changes have a broader scope: they work not only on grammatical, but on lexical elements as well (e. g. word-class change, exaptation, corpulenting – this can also operate in analogical rebuilding of stems: *fej, száj*), and some of them appear only in one or two types of affixes (e.g. bushing).

It can't be evaded to talk about the direction and about the course of different language changes. For example, grammaticaliza-

---

[17] I kept the metaphorical part of the Hungarian term *bokrosodás* (see *bokor* ›bush‹), so *bushing* means ›becoming a bush‹. The process is similar to accumulation, when two inflectional endsuffixes attach, but bushing works only on derivational suffixes.

tion, degrammaticalization and lexicalization present the following characterics:[18]

grammaticalization: gradual, the grammaticality of the linguistic unit grows, unidirectional;

degrammaticalization: gradual, the grammaticality of the linguistic unit decreases, unidirectional;

lexicalicalization: abrupt, the grammaticality of the linguistic unit decreases, no direction.

This way we can show students how to differentiate between forms of evolution of grammatical units, and point to the major aspects to be taken into consideration for making such distinctions, namely, the linguistic level the change works on, the nature of the process, and the direction of change.

3. 1 The evolution of Hungarian function words through grammaticalization

In this chapter, I present the categories of function words in Hungarian that evolved through grammaticalization. Showing the emergence of these categories through tables gives us the opportunity to throw into relief the common and differing features of them. We can rearrange the colums and lines of the table according to the chosen perspective on grammaticalization under discussion, viz. categories, source word-classes, source constructions, historical periods (in Dér 2008b I already used this grouping for the categories and periods; table 1 and 2 are a more complex summation of the relevant aspects, supporting a more detailed analysis).

---

[18] cf. Norde 2001, 235–238.

Table 1. Grammaticalization of categories of function words in Hungarian which originated in parent language

CATEGORY (WORD-CLASS)	SOURCE WORD-CLASS (with examples of grammati-calized results)	SOURCE CONSTRUCTIONS	TIME PERIOD OF HUNGARIAN
Postposition	Noun with in-flectional endsuffix	Unmarked possessive construction (*vmi alól – alatt – alá* ›from under – under/beneath – underneath‹; **belen* 'in', *helyett* ›instead of‹)	Proto-[19] and Old Hungarian
		Marked possessive construction (*vmi(nek) az után(a)* ›after‹; *vmi fejében* ›in place of‹)	From Proto-Hungarian until now
		Quality attributive construction (pl. *vmi módra* ›-ly‹)	From Old Hungarian until now
		Adverbial construction (pl. *vmivel ellentétben* ›opposed to‹, *vmiből kifolyólag* ›as a result of‹)	From New Hungarian until now
	adverb	appositional construction (pl. *vmin által*	From Proto-Hungarian until now

---

[19] *Proto-* is here the English equivalent for *ős* and not for *elő* (but it has got both meanings in English).

		›through‹, *vmin belül* ›within, in‹) All of them are postposition which attract suffix.	
	adverbial participle	adverbial con-struction (pl. *vmihez viszonyítva* ›in correlation with/to‹) All of them are postposition which attract suffix.	From Proto-Hungarian until now
		Subjective construction (pl. *vmi múlva* ›in, after‹)	From Proto-Hungarian until Middle Hungarian
		Objective con-struction (pl. *vmit kivéve* ›except of‹, *vmit tekintve* ›in view of‹) All of them are postposition which attract suffix	From Proto-Hungarian until now
Modal word	demonstrative pronoun (pl. *ne* ›no, don't‹)	Attributive construction	Proto-Hungarian
	adverb (pl. *bizonyára* ›surely‹, *valóban* ›in deed‹)	Adverbial construction	From Proto-Hungarian until now
	verb (pl. *talán* ›maybe‹,	Predicative verb as main clause	Proto-Hungarian

199

	hiszen ›because‹)		
	adjective (pl. *bizony* ›indeed‹)	Predicative adjective as main clause	Proto-Hungarian
Particle	demonstrative (pl. *-e* ›question tag‹)	Attributive construction	Proto-Hungarian
	adverb (pl. *még* ›yet, still‹*, már* ›already‹*, csak* ›just, only‹)	Adverbial construction	From Proto-Hungarian until now
	Verb (pl. *lám* ›lo‹*, hadd* ›let (me)‹*, akár* ›just, or‹)	Predicative verb in main or dependent clause	Proto-Hungarian
	Adjective (pl. *csupa* ›all‹*, egész* ›whole, total‹)	Adverbial construction (*csupa* 'csupán', *egész* 'wholly')	Old and Middle Hungarian
	?conjunction (pl. *ha* ›if‹*, is* ›also‹)[20]	Inorganic construction	Old and Middle Hungarian
	Modal word (pl. *tán* ›maybe‹*, hisz* ›because‹)	Inorganic construction (the indirect antecedent was an adverbial construction, which was the source of the modal word, and then emerged the particle)	Old and Middle Hungarian
	Interjection (*vaj* ›whether‹)	Inorganic construction	Old Hungarian

---

[20] It is disputable whether the evolution of particles from conjunction is or is not grammaticalization.

200

Verbal prefix	adverb (pl. *ki-* ›out‹, *be-* ›in(to)‹, *alá-* ›into‹, *össze-* ›together‹, *szét-* ›apart‹, *túl-* ›over, out‹)[21]	Adverbial appositional construction	From Proto-Hungarian until now[22]
	Noun with suffix (pl. *agyon* ›to brain‹, *végbe* ›off‹)	Adverbial construction	From Middle Hungarian until now
Auxiliary verb	verb (pl. *-t vala/volt* ›past perfect‹, *Ø vala/volt* ›past imperfect‹)	Coordinative construction (predicative noun + *volna*)	Proto-Hungarian
	verb (pl. *kezd* ›to start, begin‹, *fog* ›will/shall/to be going to (future)*, talál* ›to find‹, *szokott* ›usually …‹')	Objective construction	From Old and Middle Hungarian until now

---

[21] About the emergence of verbal prefixes out of postpositional phrases see Forgács 2003 and D. Mátai 2007, 85–87. I agree with D. Mátai who refuses some of Forgács's statements. He claims that verbal prefixes can also grammaticalize from postpositions, but it is questionable.

[22] Some linguists claim that verbal prefixation was born in Old Hungarian, because *the system* of verbal prefixation was developing about that time. However some prefixes already existed in the parent language (e. g. *ki* 'out'). Honti 2001 thinks that the category of verbal prefixes is an inheritance of the Ugrian period, because the verbal prefixes of Ugrian languages arised from the same stems and behave similarly. Since the process was not interrupted, I decided to use Proto-Hungarian for entry time of verbal prefixation instead of Old Hungarian.

Table 2: Grammaticalization of new categories of function words in Hungarian

CATEGORY (WORD-CLASS)	SOURCE WORD-CLASS (with examples of grammatica-lized results)	SOURCE CON-STRUCTIONS	TIME PERIOD
Conjunction	Relative pro-noun /adverb (*hogy* ›that‹, *ha* ›if‹, *mint* ›like‹)	Adverbial construction	From Proto-Hungarian (until now)
	Verb (*vagy* ›or‹, *akár* ›or‹, *hiszen*)	Predicative verb as main clause	Proto-Hungarian (and Old Hungarian)
	Adverbial participle (*illetve* ›and, or‹)	Adverbial construction	New Hungarian
	Modal word (pl. *ugyanis* ›namely‹)	Inorganic construction/collocation	Old Hungarian
	?Particle (pl. *de* ›but‹, *ám* ›however‹, *bár* ›although‹)	Inorganic construction/collocation	Proto-Hungarian (and Old and Middle Hungarian)
Definite article	Demonstrative pronoun (*az/a* ›the‹)	Determiner attributive construction	Old Hungarian
Indefinite article	Numeral and indefinite pronoun (*egy* ›a/an‹)	Attributive construction	Old Hungarian

3. 2. The evolution of Hungarian affixes

The aforementioned remarks can well be demonstrated by presenting in the classroom the evolution of the affixal system in Hungarian. Table 3 summarizes the changes which can create

affixes in Hungarian, some of them being typical, some of them existing only among derivational or inflectional suffixes.

Table 3: Evolution and further development of affixes in Hungarian with examples[23]

LANGUAGE CHANGE /TYPES OF AFFIX		DERIVATIO-NAL SUFFIXES	INFLECTIO-NAL MARKERS	INFLEC-TIO-NAL END-SUFFIXES
grammatical ization	Primary grammatical ization (sources: pronouns, nouns wth suffixes)	*-hat/-het (fut<u>hat</u>* ›may/can run‹)	Personal possessive suffix (*könyve<u>m</u>, könyve<u>d</u>* stb. ›my book, your book, etc.‹)	corpulent adverbial suffixes: *-ban/-ben* (*a ház<u>ban</u>* ›in the house‹)
	Secondary grammatical ization (change in function, change in affix-type)	*-s*[24] (*zölde<u>s</u>* ›greenish‹)	plural ending on nouns: *-<u>k</u>*[25] (*háza<u>k</u>*)	verbal personal endsuffixes (*néze<u>k</u>, néze<u>l</u>* stb. ›I look, you look, etc.‹)
corpulenting (and split)		*-dalom/-delem* (*lako<u>dalom</u>* ›bridal‹)	—	*-on/-en/-ön* (*ház<u>on</u>* ›on the house‹)
reanalysis		*-si* (*falu<u>si</u>* ›rural‹)	—	—
conscious word-formation/exaptation		*-cs* (*ura<u>cs</u>*	—	—

---

[23] The typical developments are marked with bold types in each affixal category; one can see the outcomes of the processes.

[24] This suffix may be led back to an Uralic diminutive derivational suffix, which have gained numerous further derivational functions, e. g. derivation of adjectives (*lila* ›purple, lilac‹→ *lilás* ›purplish‹).

[25] Evolved from derivational suffix of collectiv nouns.

203

	›lord‹)		
back-formation (adaptation, revival of wordends)	-da from csár<u>da</u> ›inn‹ → e. g. étkez<u>de</u> ›eating-house‹	—	—
exaptation	—	—	-n[26] (adjo<u>n</u> ›may/must give‹)
degrammaticalization	-i (Ferenc<u>i</u> ›cognomen Ferenc + i‹)[27]	Possession marker: -é (fiúé)[28]	—
bushing of derivational suffixes	-dad/-ded (apró<u>dad</u> ›tiny‹)	—	—
accumulation of inflectional endsuffixes	—	—	-ig (ház<u>ig</u> ›til the house‹)

In virtue of the types of change described above, and of other facts of Hungarian language history we are able to make the following observations:

Primary and secondary grammaticalization was dominant in the emergence of all types of affixes, and this is especially true for corpulent adverbial endsuffixes and verbal endsuffixes, as the vast majority of the elements of both groups is the result of grammati-calization processes.

Derivational suffixes were crucial sources of affixes (besides nouns with inflectional endsuffixes): their secondary grammatica-

---

[26] Emerged from instantaneous derivational suffix.

[27] Evolved from possession marker.

[28] Originated in lative inflectional endsuffix. In Hungarian we put the possession marker -é on the denomination of the possessor: A könyv Pistá**é**. ›The book belongs to Pista.‹

lization was typical in Hungarian, and they evolved to inflectional markers and endsuffixes. A perfect demonstration for this are verbal personal endsuffixes: those that did not originate in pronouns developed surely from derivational suffixes.

Apart from some peculiar cases, derivational suffixes already emerged as such, and continued their way in Hungarian language, except when they grammaticalized into other types of affixes or became obsolent. It can be supposed that these primary suffixes had evolved from pronouns of the parent language, long before Hungarian language was born. However, proving the existence of these grammaticalization processes is very difficult, because almost all sounds of the parent language were used in derivational suffixes, therefore we can not confirm or disconfirm this kind of change.[29]

Inflectional markers have mostly arisen from personal pronouns. In the remaining cases the original marker has gain new functions or a derivational suffix became an inflectional marker or an endsuffix (these are rare cases of degrammaticalization).

Inflectional endsuffixes emerged mostly through primary grammaticalization, while other types of change (exaptation, corpulatenting, etc.) were only sporadic.

The next step could be to show students another aspect of the consequences of language processes: what happened in the paradigms? The diversity of changes is most striking in the paradigm of personal possessive suffixes (see table 4).

Table 4: The system of personal possessive suffixes in Hungarian[30]

	Personal possessive suffix			
Sg. 1.	*háza**m*** ›my house‹	*keze**m*** ›my hand‹	*kutyá**m*** ›my dog‹	*kerte**m*** ›my garden‹
Sg. 2.	*háza**d*** ›your house‹	*kezed* ›your hand‹	*kutyá**d*** ›your dog‹	*kerte**d*** ›your garden‹

---

[29] Cf. Hajdú 1988, 94.

[30] Suffixes or parts of suffixes which emerged out of personal pronouns are marked with bold type.

Sg. 3.	*háza* ›his/her/its house‹	*keze* ›his/her/its hand‹	*kutyája* ›his/her/its dog‹	*kertje* ›his/her/its garden‹
Pl. 1.	*házunk* ›our house‹	*kezünk* ›our hand‹	*kutyánk* ›our dog‹	*kertünk* ›our garden‹
Pl. 2.	*házatok* ›your house‹	*kezetek* ›your hand‹	*kutyátok* ›your dog‹	*kertetek* ›your garden‹
Pl. 3.	*házuk* ›their house‹	*kezük* ›their hand‹	*kutyájuk* ›their dog‹	*kertjük* ›their garden‹

The similarity of personal possessive suffixes to suffixes of definite conjugation (*nézem, nézed, nézi* stb.) can be explained with their common origin,[31] all of them going back to personal pronouns (*m^-, *t^-, *s^-) in the parent language, which agglutinated to the appropiate stems, for instance: *ház + én* ›house‹ + ›I, me‹ = *házam* ›my house‹ and ›the house is mine‹. The forms of plural third person (*házuk* ›their house‹, *nézik* ›they look at (def. conj.)‹, *nézniük* ›to look at (infinitive)‹, *velük* ›with them‹) are an exception: in these cases the plural marker *-k* changed its function and became a possessive suffix, and this marker returns in some other cases of the plural paradigm, too: *nézi-te-**k*** ›you (Pl. 2nd) look at‹, *velün**k*** ›with us‹, etc. The *-j* of Sg. 3 and of Pl. 3 formes was an intrusive consonant (Old Hungarian *almá+j+á* ›his/her apple‹) and spread analogically to other stems.

Connecting the tables of the evolution of function words and affixes with each other, and based on other facts of Hungarian language history we can come to the following conclusions:

The transformation of some postpositions to adverbial end-suffixes was a typical case of grammaticalization in Hungarian. However, it occured only in the cases of those postpositions that evolved from nouns with an endsuffix in unmarked possessive constructions. These postpositions later became extinct, as their

---

[31] This is also true for the inflectional endsuffixes of infinitives (*nézne**m**, nézne**d**, nézni**e*** stb. ›to look Sg. 1., Sg. 2., Sg. 3‹) and for the postpositional forms of personal pronouns: *vele**m**, vele**d**, vel**e*** stb. (›with me‹, ›with you‹, ›with him/her/it‹).

descendant endsuffixes took up their functions (pl. *royol > *-ról/-ről* ›(delative) off, from‹; *eret > *-ért* ›(causal-final) for the purpose of‹).

After the Old Hungarian period postpositions and adverbial endsuffixes never grammaticalized in unmarked possessive constructions anymore, since the possessive relation became marked in Hungarian and the creation of unmarked constructions stopped. Marked possessive constructions are still a rich source in the creation of newer postpositions.

Most of the function words in Hungarian didn't turn into affixes, they kept their word-status.

Category shift among function words is a rare phenomenon in Hungarian, especially the grammaticalization version of it. We can registrate this phenomenon only some cases, like in modal word > particle (pl. *talán* > *tán* ›maybe‹) pattern.

4. Conclusion

Grammaticalization is a very complex phenomenon, it can affect more linguistic levels at one time and takes its course through centuries. During lectures and courses about grammaticalization and language change at the universities we can touch upon several subjects of historical and general linguistics. We could say, grammaticalization is the perfect candidate to show all the important things about language change and language history.

Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church
Department of Hungarian Linguistics
csillader@gmail.com

References

Davidse, Kristin; Vandelanotte, Lieven; Cuyckens, Hubert (Hg.): *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*. Berlin/New York, In press*.*

Dér, Csilla Ilona: Önálló nyelvváltozás-e a degrammatikalizáció? In: Tolcsvai Nagy, Gábor; Ladányi, Mária (Hg.): *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok XXII.*

Tanulmányok a funkcionális nyelvészet köréből. Budapest 2008 (2008a), 121–160.

Dér, Csilla Ilona: Grammatikalizáció. In: *Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 158* (2008 [2008b]), 405–439.

Detges, Ulrich; Waltereit, Richard (eds): *The paradox of grammatical change. Perspectives from Romance*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia 2008.

Eythórsson, Thórdallur (Hg.): *Grammatical change and linguistic theory: the Rosendal papers*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia 2008.

Forgács, Tamás: Lexikalizálódási és grammatikalizálódási folyamatok frazeológiai egységekben. In: *Magyar Nyelv* 99 (2003), 259–273.

Givón, Talmy. The evolution of dependent clause morpho-syntax in Biblical Hebrew. In: Traugott, Elizabeth Closs; Heine, Bernd (eds): *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Vol. II. Amsterdam / Philadelphia 1991, 257–310.

Hajdú, Péter. *Bevezetés az uráli nyelvtudományba. A magyar nyelv finnugor alapjai*. (4. kiadás) Budapest 1988.

Harris, Alice; Campbell, Lyle: *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective*. Cambridge 1995.

Haspelmath, Martin: Does grammaticalization need reanalysis? In: *Studies in Language* 22/ 2 (1998), 315–351.

Haspelmath, Martin: On directionality in language change with particular reference to grammaticalization. In: Fischer, Olga; Norde, Muriel; Perridon, Harry (Hg.): *Up and down the cline: The nature of grammaticalization*. Typological Studies in Language 59. Philadelphia / Amsterdam 2004, 17–44.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P.: Lexicalization and grammaticization: opposite or orthogonal? In: Bisang, Walter; Wiemer, Björn; Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. (eds): *What makes grammaticalization – a look from its components and its fringes*. Berlin 2004, 21–42.

Honti, László: A magyar igekötő: nyelvünk kései jövevénye? In: Bakró-Nagy, Marianne; Bánréti, Zoltán; É. Kiss, Katalin (eds): *Újabb tanulmányok a strukturális magyar nyelvtan és a nyelvtörténet köréből. Kiefer Ferenc tiszteletére barátai és tanítványai*. Budapest 2001, 357–367.

Joseph, Brian D.: Is there such a thing as „grammaticalization"? In: Language Sciences 23 (2001), 163–186.

Korompay, Klára: A névszóragozás. In: Benkő, Loránd; E. Abaffy, Erzsébet; Rácz, Endre (eds): *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana II/1. A kései ómagyar kor. Morfematika*. Budapest 1992, 355–410.

208

Lehmann, Christian: *Thoughts on grammaticalization: A programmatic sketch*. Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-Projekts 48. Cologne 1982.

Lindström Tiedemann, Therese: *The history of the concept of grammaticalisation*. PhD Thesis. University of Sheffield 2005.

López-Couso, María José; Seoane, Elena; Fanego, Teresa (eds): *Rethinking grammaticalization: New perspectives.* Typological studies in language 76. Amsterdam / Philadelphia 2008 (2008a).

López-Couso, María José; Seoane, Elena; Fanego, Teresa (eds): *Theoretical and empirical issues in grammaticalization*. Typological studies in language 77. Amsterdam / Philadelphia 2008 (2008b).

D. Mátai, Mária: *A magyar szófajtörténet általános kérdései*. Budapest 2007.

McDaniels, Todd: What's wrong with reanalysis? In: *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics 21* (2003), 81–88.

Newmeyer, Frederick J.: Deconstructing grammaticalization. In: *Language Sciences 23* (2001), 187–229.

Norde, Muriel: Deflexion as a counterdirectional factor in grammatical change. In: *Language Sciences 23* (2001), 231–264.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs: From etymology to historical pragmatics. In: Minkova, Donka; Stockwell, Robert (eds): *Studies in the history of the English language: A millennial perspective*. Berlin / New York 2002, 19–49.