Nominalization in Old Hungarian texts

(Article begins on next page)

25 April 2024

Nominalization in Old Hungarian texts

Nominalization refers to a noun phrase which has the underlying semantic structure of a clause. Two types of nominalization can be distinguished: one at the level of a word; the other type is the nominalized clauses which can again be divided into two sub-types (nominalization between a verb and a full clause; nominalization of full clauses). In the present article I shall study explicit and implicit objective and final clauses together with participial and gerundive constructions.

The aim of the present article is to analyze whether Old Hungarian (OH) had nominalized constructions of the Finnish, Turkish (TR) etc. type. The questions that Angela Marcantonio asks in her article will be investigated: 'did **H** have (also) nominalized constructions of the Finnish, Turkish etc. type – of which the *men-t-em-ben* type appears to be a trace – but lost them (perhaps *also* under the heavy influence of Latin), or did **H** ever had them?' (2018:18)

This article is divided into two different parts in order to examine these questions. As a first step, it would be necessary to have an insight into whether OH was heavily influenced by Latin (L) and that could be the reason for the richness of nominalized constructions in OH. In this article, it would only be possible to analyze if nominalized constructions were influenced by Latin. In the first part, I shall illustrate this by studying examples from the Codex of Jokai and the Codex of Bécs. I have chosen these old texts because the Codex of Jokai is the earliest available hand-written Hungarian (H) book (14th century), and the Codex of Bécs is a collection of the earliest available (15th century) Hungarian translations of the Bible. Both texts are translations from Latin texts. Only a smaller part of the texts have been chosen because these had sufficient to have enough examples in order to draw some conclusions. The Hungarian examples with their Latin parallels were compared head on and the forms or constructions of nominalization were examined. The working method used is based on statistical analysis of the data obtained by examining examples from old Hungarian codices. Firstly, relevant examples were collected. Secondly, the examples were categorized according to their type of nominalization. The percentage level would indicate the intensity of nominalizations in each selected text. In this way it would be possible to compare the amount of nominalizations in translated and non-translated texts so that it can be observed whether Latin affected the richness of nominalized cases in OH. Thereafter, the amount of each type of nominalization should be examined and each example be compared head on with their Latin counterparts, so that it could be ascertained which type of constructions were affected (if they were) more.

In the second part, samples from the Codex of Domonkos (16th century) were gathered because this text is the first non-translation and for this reason, this codex would be a good choice to ascertain the position of OH in the field of nominalization. The following is assumed: if OH uses different constructions in translated texts than original (non-translation) H texts, it could suggest that original texts might be better subjects for examination instead of translated texts. New elements can enter a language throughout translations like calques (phonological, morphological,

phraseological, etc.). According to this assumption, it is not excluded that the richness of nominalized constructions in OH was caused by the influence of other languages.

These exercises are necessary to reach the principal objective which would be to investigate whether OH had similar types of nominalization as Turkish has. These Turkish type constructions are available in dialectical Hungarian, however it is not revealed whether OH texts already had them. The intention is to follow the terms of Marcantonio (2018) for Turkish type nominalization and attention would be focused on samples of the Turkish type participial suffix *-DXk-* which can co-exist with nominal endings (case suffixes, possessive suffix).

<center>***</center>

The following types of nominalization are sought:

a) objective clauses which are expressed in two ways:

The objective clause takes place of the direct object of a verb. This explicit form is introduced by *hogy* 'that' and the definite or objective verb conjugation (Marcantonio 2018:5). The other possible way to express this nominalization, is the usage of infinitive. The first one occurs very frequently since it is now the standard utterance, while the second one is rarer in MH.

b) final clauses which are expressed in two ways:

The final clause expresses the purpose of the action. It is introduced by *hogy* 'that' while the verb is in the imperative form. The other common way is the usage of the infinitive form of the verb. Both types are commonly encountered in MH.

c) participle and gerundive:

The participial type of nominalization is often used in MH, while the gerundive seems to be less frequent in modern language usage compared to the participle.

d) 'Turkish type' nominalization:

In this article, attention will be directed to the nominalized constructions containing a participial suffix *-DXk*. The *-DXk* type of nominalization is recorded from the Old Turkic era with the form of *-dOk* which is used mainly in runiform and Manichaean sources when the head refers to participants other than the subject (e.g. the direct or indirect object) or to circumstances (e.g. the time of the event) (Erdal 2004: 293-5). They form determined participial nouns in a determinative group. These participial constructs create subordinate clauses: *Tañrı arturduğı gişi* 'the one whom God has made successful' (Turan 2001: 457).

This type is very rarely encountered in standard MH, but often occurs in dialects. It can co-exist occasionally with a possessive suffix and creates a syntactically active participle. It can be used as object participle:

Yazdığı mektubu aldım. 'I have received the letter that he wrote.'

As relative participles:

Söyledikleri mantıklıdır. 'What they are saying/said is/was sensible.'

It has temporal value as well. I report here my literal translation of the following Turkish sentences into H. Notice how the nominal phrase has a very different construction from English. In H these kind of sentences are not considered 'nice', but they are still possible sentences. It is to be demonstrated here that even if the Hungarian translations are not commonly acceptable (they exist in dialects), it is possible to have literal translations from these type of Turkish sentences while it would not be possible to have them in English. In addition, although this participle is morphologically a past participle, it may denote past and present meanings (Turan 2001: 460) as it is the case of the *mentemben* constructions in H as well.

1) TR: Çarşıya gittiğimde sana da uğrarım.

H: A piacra mentemben, hozzád is beugrom.

'When I go to the market, I will go to your place too.'

2) TR: Çarşıya gittiğimde sana da uğradım.

H: A piacra mentemben, hozzád is beugrottam.

'When I went to the market, I went to your place too.'

I)   Translated texts

For the first task, examples taken from Codex of Jokai and Codex of Bécs which have Latin versions as well, have been analyzed so it is assumed that these texts could have been influenced by their Latin translations. If so, the high amount of examples of nominalization, can be accounted for by Latin.

Codex of Jokai

93 examples of nominalizations from 212 examined lines have been discovered in this codex.

a) objective clauses: 27

13 examples for explicit objective clauses have been found in this text. As far as the grammatical forms are concerned, from the H side conditional mood was used once, past tense seven times and present perfect five times, while L used the imperfect tense five times, perfect tenses four times and participles four times. At the same time, it was clearly noticeable that where the L form is passive, OH uses causative mood.

1) OH: mendenestewl meg zÿrnÿeedett es meg sargolott vgÿ hogÿ sokaktol balkatagnak **aloÿtattnek** (002/22-23)
   L: totus deformis et squalidus, ita ut a multis **putaretur** insanus

'he was wholly deformed and squalid, so that out of many people might think that he is mad'

OH: **aloÿt-att-nek**
think – Caus.Cond. 3rdSg.
L: **putaretur**
think- Imperf.Subj.Pass.3rdSg.

2) OH: letuala mÿkent vak ÿgy hogÿ keueset **latuala** (009/2-3)
L: factus est quasi caecus, ita ut parum **videret**
'He became like a blind man, so he saw little'

OH: **lat-uala**
see- Pres.Perf.3rdSg.
L: **videret**
see- Imperf.Subj.Act.3rdSg.

3) OH: hogy frater Bernald ew tewle harumzor **hyutattot** (010/2-
L: quod frater Bernardus ter ab eo **vocatus**
'that brother Bernard was called three times by him'

OH: **hyu-tat-tot**
call-Caus.Past 3rdSg.
L: **vocatus**
call-Part.Perf.Pass.Sg.

14 sentences have been observed where the infinitive form was used in OH. In ten cases the pure infinitive was used, while in four cases it was used with the possessive suffix. For the L version the infinitive was used ten times, the participle once, the gerundive once and the present tense once. There was no correspondence on only one occasion. Generally it can stated that where L uses the infinitive, OH also uses it.

4) OH: **Tundni** melt azert hog mi atyánk bodog fferench menden miuelkedetiben: istenhez volt hassonlatos (001/10)
L: Primo igitur **sciendum** est, quod beatus pater noster Franciscus in omnibus suis actibus fuit Christo conformis.
'First it should be noted that blessed Father Francis was like Christ in all his actions.'

OH: **tundni**
know-Inf.
L: **sciendum**
know-Part. Inst. Pass. Sg.

5) OH: Tehát elett e ylnemew ocual: hogÿ mÿcoron valamennÿet ew agÿaban nugonnak mutata magatt **alonnÿ** fennent es melsegest (004/7-10)

L: Unde usus est tali cautela, quod quum aliquantulum in suo lecto quievisset, finxit se alté **dormire** et profundissime stertere.

'Therefore, caution should be used while he rested a little in his own bed, pretended to be asleep and snoring deeply.'

OH: **alon-nÿ**
sleep-Inf.

L: **dormire**
sleep- Pres. Inf. Act.

6) OH: erewl mÿ vronknak iesus cristusnak **kel** tanalczat **kerdenewk** (005/22-24)
   L: de hoc est consilium Domini nostri Jesu Christi requirendum
   'from this we have to ask our lord, Jesus Christ's advice.'

OH: **kel**	**kerd-enewk**
have to-Pres.3rdSg.	ask-Inf. Poss. 1stPl.
L: **est**	**requirendum**
be-Pres.3rdSg.Ind.Act	look after-Sg. Ger.

Here an unusual construction can be observed in the *nekÿ kell mÿt mondaz* where the author used the present tense in *mondaz* instead of the standard infinitive+possessive construction. One notices that in the L version the present tense was also used, which probably means that the usage of this tense was copied into the Hungarian text.

7) OH: De vr bernald monda **nekÿ kell** mÿt **mondaz** (006/10-11)
   L: Dominus autem Bernardus dixit: „Placet, quod **dicis**."
   'Bernard Lord said: "I like what you say."

OH: **nekÿ**	**kell**	**mondaz**
Pers.Pron.3rdSing+Dat.	have to-Pres.3rdSg.	say-Pres.2ndSg.
L:-	-	**dicis**
		say- Pres.Ind.Act.2ndSg.

b) final clauses: 20

In the examined text there are 11 phrases for explicit final clauses. In nine phrases the conditional mood and in one phrase the past tense was used in OH. In the L text the subjunctive was discovered nine times and no correspondences for the OH form were found on two occasions. However, it is possible to state that in general where L uses the subjunctive, OH uses the conditional mood.

8) OH: Es ÿstentewl yhlelmÿatt vendege hÿva zent ferencet hogÿ estue uele **ennek** (003/18-2)
   L: Et inspiratus a Domino invitavit sanctum Franciscum, ut manducaret cum eo de sero
   'He was inspired by the Lord to invite Saint Francis to have dinner with him in the evening'

OH: **en-nek**
eat-Cond.Pres.3rdSg.
L: **manducaret**
chew - Imperf. Subj. 3rdSg.

Here the verb is in the past tense instead of the infinitive or conditional:

9) OH: Azert hogy elewzer ew **vewn** ewangeliumy zegenseget(008/18-21)
   L: pro eo, quod evangelicam paupertatem
   'so that he would receive the poverty of the Gospel first'

   OH: **vew-n**
   receive-Past3rdSg.
   L: -

When it comes to the infinitive form, nine phrases containing the infinitive for purpose have been found of which eight were pure infinitive and only in one phrase did occur with the possessive suffix. In all L phrases the infinitive was used. In general, where Latin uses the infinitive., OH uses infinitive as well.

10) OH: Ha **akarz** tekelletes **lenÿ** (006/19-20)
    L: Si **vis** perfectus **esse**
    'If you want to be perfect.'

    OH: **akar-z**   **len-ÿ**
    want-Pres.2ndSg.   be-Inf.
    L: **vis**   **esse**
    want-Pres.2ndSg. Ind.Act. be- Pres. Inf. Act.

c) participial and gerundive: 48

   In the examined part of the codex three phrases in which past participle was used in OH have been observed while the corresponding L forms used the participle twice and the adjective once. The amount of data is not sufficient to draw a conclusion whether OH and L almost always use the participle as correspondences.

11) OH: Mert mikepen **aldot** cristus (001/10-11)
    L: Nam sicut Christus **benedictus**
    'For the Blessed Christ'

    OH: **ald-ot**
    bless-Past Part.Sg.
    L: **benedictus**
    bless- Part. Perf. Pass. Sg.

12) OH: elewlsew es **eleve zÿlettett** ÿdenek eleztebuoltabal (002/15)

L: Quorum primus et primogenitus, tam prioritate temporis
'First, and oldest, and the priority of time'

OH: **eleve zÿlet-tett**
first be born- Past Part.Sg.
L: **primogenitus**
first-born Adj.Sg.

45 gerundive forms in OH have been discovered where L used the participle 38 times, the gerundive twice, the adverb once and no correspondences four times. In general, where the OH form is gerundive, the L form is almost always participial.

13) OH: mendent el hagyuan (001/12-13)
L: omnia relinquentes
'leaving all'

OH: **hagy-uan**
leave behind-Ger.
L: **relinquentes**
leave behind- Part.Pres. Pl.

14) OH: De wr Bernald vetee azt ewn zÿueben **reÿtezuen** ewrÿzni eÿel (004/5-6)
L: Dominus autem Bernardus proposuit in corde suo illum **latenter** observare de nocte.
'Bernard Lord has purposed in his heart to observe him secretly in the night.

OH: **reÿtez-uen**
hide- Ger.
L: **latenter**
secretly- Adv.

15) OH: De p[ro]phetalo lelekuel vilagossolot **eleuelattuan** nagÿ gondokot (005/2-3)
L: Spiritu enim prophetico illuminatus, **praevidendo** magnolia
'Prophetic spirit is illuminated by foreseeing big problems'

OH: **eleuelatt-uan**
foresee-Ger.
L: **praevidendo**
foresee-Ger.Sg.

Partial analysis:

In the Codex of Jokai from 212 lines 93 lines contain cases of nominalizations which are 44% of the total cases.

27 objective type of nominalizations were found in the examined part of the Codex. This is 30% of the total nominalized cases.

For the 13 OH explicit objective clauses the conditional mood was used once, the past tense seven times and the present perfect five times while L used different constructions: five imperfect, four perfect tenses and four participles. With considering that the five OH present perfects correspond to the four L perfect tenses, the correspondence expressed in percentage is 80%. The seven OH past tense forms could be counted as correspondences to the five L imperfect forms. In this case the correspondence is 71%.

In the case of the use of infinitive for expressive purposes, there were 14 cases in OH, while L uses the infinitive ten times. OH used the infinitive for the L infinitive in all cases, however it also used it for the participle once, the gerundive once, the present tense once and no correspondence once. Calculating in this way, the correspondence is 71% between the grammatical forms of these two languages.

There are 29 final clauses found in the examined text which are 31% of the total nominalized cases. For 11 OH explicit final clauses, nine conditionals and one past tense were used. In L nine subjunctives were used while in two occasions no correspondence was found. In this case, it seems to be logical to consider the nine OH conditional cases and the nine L subjunctive cases as correspondences. The correspondence for these grammatical forms in a percentage is 100%, however taking into account the two cases as correspondences, the calculation would change and the correspondence would be 81%.

For the nine OH infinitive forms nine L infinitive were used, so the total correspondence is 100%.

The three OH participial constructions are 3% of the total nominalized cases. For these OH constructions L used the participle twice and the adjective once. The correspondence is 67%, however the amount of data is not sufficient to draw a conclusion whether OH and L almost always use participle as correspondences.

The 45 OH gerundive forms are 48% of the total nominalized cases. For these OH forms 38 L participial constructions were found. At other times L used the gerundive twice, the adverb once and no correspondences four times. This means, the correspondence is 84%.

In conclusion, the correspondences between the L and OH forms appear to be sufficient in order to claim that there is a significantly high possibility of a L linguistic influence on OH in the examined examples.

Codex of Bécs

The first book (Ruth) of the Codex of Bécs has been examined and 46 sentences of nominalization in total from 85 examined lines have been observed.

a) objective clauses: 14

14 objective clauses have been discovered from which nine form part of the explicit type and five form part of the infinitive type. The grammatical forms which were used to express the object in both OH and L were analyzed. Conditional moods were used eight times Imperative one in OH, while in the Latin version nine Subjunctive moods were used for the corresponding OH forms as the following examples show.

16) OH: es a ferfivnac nevét mégmonda hoǵ Booznac **hiuattatnec** (Ruth 2,19)
    L: et nomen dixit viri quod Booz **vocaretur**
    'and she told the man's name, that he was called Booz'

    OH: hiuattat-nec
    call-Cond.3rdPl.
    L: vocaretur
    call-Imperf. Subj. Pass. 3rdSg.

17) OH: oǵad hoǵ valaki mégne ésmerie hoǵ ide **iőttél léǵ** (Ruth 3,14)
    L: ne quis noverit quod huc **veneris**
    'Beware lest any man know that thou camest hither.'

    OH: iőttél léǵ
    come-Past 2ndSg.   be-Imp. 2ndSg.
    L: veneris
    come-perf. Subj. 2ndSg.

As far as the infinitive type is concerned, in all cases it was used the possessive suffixes in OH while the infinitive form was used in L as well.

18) OH: tud tégedet erős elmelő nemberinec **lennéd** (Ruth 3,11)
    L: mulierem te **esse** virtutis
    'know that thou art a virtuous woman'

    OH: len-néd
    be-Inf + Poss. 2ndSg.
    L: esse
    be-Pres.Inf.

b) final clauses: 29

In final clauses introduced by *hogy* in MH the verb in the imperative form is used, however in this old text, from 21 examples in seven cases the conditional mood was used. In the remnant 14 cases the imperative was used. For the L parallels, in 18 phrases the subjunctive was used, while there are no correspondences for two phrases and for one phrase the infinitive was used. To summarize, generally speaking, for the majority of the cases where OH uses imperative mood, L uses subjunctive.

19) OH: hoǵ őneuezete ő neméből … lene **törlessék** (Ruth 4,10)
    Latin: sua ne vocabulum eius de familia …. **Deleatur**

'lest his name be cut off, from among his family'

OH: **törl-essék**
cut off - Impr.3rdSing.
L: **deleatur**
erase-Pres.Subj.Pass.3rdSg.

20) OH: Kit akarom hoġ **hal'** te (Ruth 4,4)
L: quod **audire** te volui
'I would have thee to understand this'

OH: **hal'**
hear-Impr.2ndSing.
L: **audire**
hear-Pres.Inf.

Eight phrases were expressed with the infinitive in OH have been discovered. From these, in six cases were the possessive suffix used as well. The picture differs a little bit in the case of L as only in four sentences the infinitive was used. In the other two cases the subjunctive and in two cases the gerundive were used in the L counterparts.

21) OH: nem akara **ellenkédni** (Ruth 1,18)
Latin: **adversari** noluit
'(she) would not be against it'

OH: **ellenkéd-ni**
oppose-Inf.
L: **adversari**
oppose-Pres.Inf.Pass

22) OH: Né akariatok őket **megtiltanotok** (Ruth 2,15)
Latin: ne **prohibeatis** eam
'hinder her not'

OH: meg-tilt-anotok
prefix-hinder- Inf.Poss. 2ndPl.
L: **prohibeatis**
hinder-Pres.Subj.2ndPl.

23) OH: Né mén éġeb mezőre gabona főket **zednéd** (Ruth 2,8)
L: ne vadas ad **colligendum** in alterum agrum
'do not go to glean in any other field'

OH: **zed-néd**

glean-Inf- Poss.2ndSg.
L: **colligendum**
obtain by begging-Ger.

c) participial and gerundive: 9

One participial and eight gerundive constructions have been found in the analyzed corpus from the H part. For the one participial example the L correspondence is in the infinitive, while as far as the gerundive is concerned L uses the participle in all cases.

24) OH: Azert Noemi latuan hoǵ Rut alhatatos elméuel zérzétté volna ő vele **mentét** (Ruth 1,18)
L: videns ergo Noemi quod obstinato Ruth animo decrevisset secum **pergere**
'Then Noemi seeing that Ruth was steadfastly determined to go with her'

OH: ment-é-t
go-Past Part.Poss.3rdSg.Acc.
L: **pergere**
go on-Pres.Inf.

25) OH: es kéré hoǵ az **elmaradando** gabona főket zédnémég (Ruth 2,7)
L: et rogavit ut spicas colligeret **remanentes**
'And she desired leave to glean the ears of corn that remain'

OH: **elmarad-ando**
remain-Pass.Ger.
Lat: **remanentes**
remain-Pres.Part.

26) OH: az aratoc ńomokat **köuetuén** (Ruth 2,7)
L: **sequens** messorum vestigia
'following the steps of the reapers'

OH: **köuet-uén**
follow-Ger.
L: **sequens**
follow-Pres.Part.

d) 'Turkish type' nominalization: 0

Partial analysis:

In the Codex of Bécs from 85 lines 46 lines contain cases of nominalizations which are 54% of the total cases.

14 objective type of nominalizations were found which are 35% of the total nominalized cases. The objective clause is expressed explicitly nine times and five times in the infinitive in OH.

In the case of explicit objective clause, L uses the subjunctive nine times and OH uses eight conditional moods for the same clause, so it means that in 89% of the cases the L subjunctive equivalent is the OH conditional. In other words, OH 89% of the cases translates the conditional as the L subjunctive.

In the case of the use of the Infinitive, L and OH also use exactly the same construction five times. The correspondence is 100%.

29 final type of nominalizations were found which are 63% of the total nominalized cases. From this 21 are explicitly expressed and the infinitive was used eight times.

In the case of 21 explicit final clauses, the conditional mood was used in OH seven times, the imperative mood 14 times, for the L subjunctive mood 18 times, the infinitive once and no correspondences twice. As it has been seen from the formal type of nominalization, the OH conditional mood usually corresponds to the L subjunctive mood in this text. In this case, the correspondence is 39%.

However, the expectation would have been an OH imperative mood – L subjunctive mood correspondence since MH prefers the usage of the imperative mood instead of the conditional mood. In this way, all L subjunctive forms would have had an OH correspondence.

For the eight infinitive cases in OH, L uses the infinitive four times, the subjunctive and the gerundive twice. It means, that the correspondence is 50%.

For the OH where there is one participial form which is 2% of the total nominalized cases, L uses the infinitive, however the amount of data is not sufficient to draw any conclusions. In the case of eight OH gerundives which are 17% of the total nominalized cases, all L forms are participial. If it is then regarded as a correspondence between the OH and L forms, the percentage is 100%.

In conclusion, the correspondences between the L and OH forms appear to be sufficient in order to claim that there is a significantly high possibility of a L linguistic influence on OH in the examined examples.

II) Non-translation OH text

In the next phase, I shall examine examples from a non-translation OH text, specifically the Codex of Domonkos with the purpose of identifying what kind of nominalization was used and whether the Turkish-type nominalization occurred.

In this codex 50 lines have shown nominalization from 250 examined lines.

a) objective clauses: 14

In the examined part 14 phrases were found which express objective clauses. From these examples, the explicit form in OH was used six times of which the conditional mood was used five times and the past perfect tense once.

27) OH: Lata ev almaban hog ev az ev méhében **viselne** egy kÿsded ebechkeet (2/19-21)
'she had seen in her womb that she was carrying a child'

    visel-ne
    carry-Cond.3rdSg.

28) OH: illyen latast mutata meg hogky evtet az kerezt vizbevl **fel emelte vala** (5/10-12)
'(s)he has seen that he would be lifted up from the sacred water'

    fel emel-te vala
    prefix. lift up-Past.Perf.3rdSg.

There were eight phrases located in the infinitive form.

29) OH: Ez idevtevl fogva kezdenek bevebben **oztogatnÿ** alamÿsnat (10/21-22)
'From this time they had started giving more alms'

    oztogat-nÿ
    give alms-Inf.

b) final clauses: 14

For the final clauses 14 phrases were found of which five phrases expressed the purpose was in the Conditional mood and Possessive suffix.

30) OH: Es hog az ev lelkeet tellÿesben **valtoztathatnaÿa** az bevlchessegre (7/2-3)
'And he would transform his soul completely into wisdom'

    valtoztat-hat-na-ÿa
    transform-able-Cond. Poss.3rdSg.

In nine cases the infinitive was used.

31) OH: valamÿ nagÿot **meg mutatnÿ** ez germekrevl (5/8-9)
'to show something big from this child'

    meg mutat-nÿ
    prefix. show-Inf.

c) participle and gerundive: 21

In the examined part of the text seven phrases which contain participial constructions have been discovered.

32) OH: az **meg hÿdegevlt** istenÿ zerelmet (3/7-8)

'the divine love which got cold'

meg hÿdegevl-t
prefix. get cold-Past Part.

33) OH: eretneksegnek **haborgatoÿa** (3/17-18)
'one who disturbs the heresy'

haborgat-o-ÿa
disturb- Pres.Part.Poss.3rdSg.

14 phrases with the gerundive constructions have been found.

34) OH: Kÿnek zentseges elete **kevuetendev** (1/4-5)
'whose saint life is to be followed'

kevuet-endev
follow-Ger.

35) OH: **kÿ jevueen** az ev mehebevl (2/23)
'coming out from her womb'

kÿ je-vueen
come out-Ger.

2) for Turkish type: 0

There is another type of nominalization in this text which has a very unusual construction for the reason that it consists of the conditional mood which co-exists with the possessive suffix. It can be observed in the case of final cases, however it occurs in different kinds of phrases as well.

36) OH: Mÿkoron zent damancos **latnaÿa** (9/15-16)
'when Saint Domonkos would have seen'
lat-na-ÿa
see- Cond.Poss.3rdSg.

III)   Comparison of the translated texts with original Hungarian text:

The amount of nominalizations:

In the Codex of Jokai from 212 lines 93 lines contain cases of nominalizations which are 44% of the total cases. 27 objective types of nominalization were found in the examined part of the Codex. This is 30% of the total nominalized cases. There are 29 final clauses in the examined text

which are 31% of the total nominalized cases. The three OH participial constructions constitute 3% of the total nominalized cases. The 45 OH gerundive forms are the 48% of the total nominalized cases.

In the Codex of Bécs from 85 lines 46 lines contain cases of nominalizations which are 54% of the total cases. 14 objective type of nominalizations were found which are 35% of the total nominalized cases. 29 final type of nominalizations were found which are 63% of the total nominalized cases. The one participial form is 2% of the total nominalized cases. The eight gerundive forms make up 17% of the total nominalized cases.

In the Domonkos codex 50 lines have demonstrated cases of nominalization from 250 examined lines which are 20% of the total. There were found 14 objective clauses which are 28% of the total nominalized cases. The 14 final clauses make up 28% of the total nominalized cases. The seven participial constructions constitute 14 % and the 14 gerundive clauses make up 28% of the total nominalized cases.

It can be clearly seen that the amount of the nominalized cases decreased in the Codex of Domonkos while the number of objective clauses does not show significant difference. The high percentage of the final clauses is remarkable in the Codex of Bécs while in the other two codices it remains very close. In the Codex of Jokai the percentage of the gerundive clauses is conspicuously high.

Usage of grammatical constructions:

In the Codex of Jokai the conditional mood was used in 8% of the cases to express explicit objective clauses, the past tense 53% of these and the present perfect only 38% of them. For the explicit final clauses, the conditional was used 82% of these and the past tense 9% of them.

In the Codex of Bécs in 89% of the cases the conditional mood was used for the explicit objective clause. For the explicit final clauses in 33% the conditional mood, in 67% the imperative mood was used in OH.

In the Codex of Domonkos for explicit objective clauses, the conditional mood was used 83% of these and the past perfect tense 17% of them. The explicit final clauses were expressed in conditional mood and possessive suffix in every case.

The change of the use of the conditional mood to express the final or objective clause seems to be gradual starting from the Codex of Jokai (14th century) and culminating with the Codex of Domonkos (16th century), although in the latest codex one may notice an appearance of a very unusual construction for Hungarian in general; the conditional mood co-exists with the possessive suffix. It is also worth noticing that the use of the conditional mood appeared to be preferred more for the final clauses in the Codex of Jokai while it was not the case in the Codex of Bécs.

Nonetheless, in spite of the great amount of analyzed phrases, none of 'Turkish type' nominalization was found in the texts. The only construction for which could be found a Turkish

counterpart is the deverbative nouns (DVN) formation which occurs with a case ending in the Codex of Jokai.

Formation DVN + Case:

37) OH: de ez frater Bernald ystenbenualo **zolasaban valuala** ÿelenseges malastott (009/17-18)
    L: Ipse frater Bernardus habebat in loquendo de Deo gratiam singularem

    OH: **zolas-a-ban**   **valuala**
    say-DVN+Poss.3rdSg.+Iness.   be-Pres.Perf.3rdSg.

In Turkish the OH 'zolasaban valuala' would be translated with a similar nominalized construction 'söylemekte idi'. The only difference is the lack of the possessive from the Turkish part.

    TR: **söyle-mek-te idi**

    say-Inf.+Loc. be-Past.3rdSg.

    In conclusion, since it was not possible to disclose any 'Turkish type' nominalization in the OH texts, it would be a valuable consideration to search for them in dialectal Hungarian. As Marcantonio suggested during a conversation, it may be conceivable that H had lost this type of nominalization before its oldest sources did.

Abbreviations:

Acc.	= Accusative
Act.	= Active
Adj.	= Adjective
Caus.	= Causative
Cond.	= Conditional
Dat.	= Dative
DVN.	= Deverbative noun
Ger.	= Gerundive
H.	= Hungarian
Imp.	= Imperative
Imperf.	= Imperfect
Ind.	= Indicative
Iness.	= Inessive
Inf.	= Infinitive
L.	= Latin
Loc.	= Locative
MH.	= Modern Hungarian
Part.	= Participle
Pass.	= Passive
Pers.	= Personal
Pl.	= Plural
Pres.	= Present
Pron.	= Pronoun
Poss.	= Possessive
Sg.	= Singular
TR.	= Turkish

Sources:

Bécsi codex, közzéteszi: VOLF György, 1874. (Nyelvemléktár 1.)

Domonkos-kódex, 1517. A nyelvemlék hasonmása és betűhű átirata. Bevezetés és jegyzetek KOMLÓSSY Gyöngyi, Budapest, Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, 1990. [!1991.], (Régi magyar kódexek, 9.)

Erdal, M. 2004: A grammar of Old Turkic. Leiden. Brill

Jókai-kódex. XIV–XV. század. A nyelvemlék betűhű olvasata és latin megfelelője, bevezetéssel és jegyzetekkel ellátva közzéteszi: P. BALÁZS János, Budapest, Akadémiai, 1981. (Codices Hungarici 8.)

Leech, G .2006: A Glossary of English Grammar. Edinburgh. Edinburgh University Press

Marcantonio, A. 2018: Nominalized subordinate clauses in Hungarian. In M. Amon & M.-A. Julia (eds), 'Oralité, Information, Typologie / Orality, Information, Typology'. Festschrift volume in honour of M.M. Jocelyne FernandezVest. Paris: L'Harmattan. Langue et Parole Series. 342-363. (in stampa).

Tekin, T. 1968: A grammar of Orkhon Turkic. Bloomington. Indiana University

Turan, F. 2001. Participial constructions in Old Anatolian Turkish: A morpho-syntactic analysis in Zarf, Turk Dili ve Edebiyatt Dergisi 1, 51-76.