The role of the predicative participle construction in the Csángó tense-aspect system*

Edith KÁDÁR
Boglárka NÉMETH
Faculty of Letters
Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj

Keywords: aspecto-temporal phenomena, predicative participle construction, the Csángó dialect, resultativity, the perfect, argument structure

Abstract: In this article we analyse the predicative participle constructions (PPC) in the most archaic dialect of Hungarian, the Csángó dialect. In this dialect the participle+copula constructions are both more productive and more diverse than in standard Hungarian. We argue that the Hungarian PPC is a perfect-like construction which belongs to the category of the so-called preaspectual items, and that the construction type in the Csángó dialect may also be considered a partial equivalent for the perfect, enriching the Csángó tense-aspect system. Our analysis also reveals the additional aspecto-temporal and syntactic phenomena related to Csángó PPC formation.

Edith Kádár: ekadar@flash.ro
Boglárka Németh: nemethbogi@gmail.com

*

In the last two decades Hungarian participle constructions became a highly debated topic in several theoretical frameworks.[1] Albeit there is no detailed analysis available for

* This article is partly based on a joint contribution written in Hungarian (Edith Kádár and Boglárka Németh, "Predikatív határozói igeneves szerkezetek csángó beszélt nyelvi szövegekben" [Predicative participle constructions in spoken Csángó], in *Nyelvelmélet és dialektológia*, ed. Katalin É. Kiss and Attila Hegedűs (Piliscsaba: PPKE BTK, 2009), 189–212.)

[1] E.g. Gábor Alberti, "Passziválási művelet a magyarban" [Passivization in Hungarian], *Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány* 37 (1996): 7–46.; Gábor Alberti, *Argument Selection* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997); Gábor Alberti, "On passivization in Hungarian", in *Approaches to Hungarian 6.*, ed. Casper de Groot and Kenesei István (Szeged: JATE, 1998), 103–123.; Huba Bartos, "The syntax of Hungarian *-vA* adverbial participles: A single affix with variable merge-in locations", in *Adverbs and Adverbial Adjuncts at the Interfaces*, ed. Katalin É. Kiss (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008), 75–101.; Annamária Bene, *Az igék bennható–mediális–tranzitív felosztásának alkalmazhatósága magyar szintaktikai és morfológiai sajátosságok magyarázatában* [The applicability of the unergative–unaccusative–transitive categorization of verbs in explaining syntactic and morphological properties of Hungarian] (PhD diss., ELTE, 2005); Tibor Laczkó, *The Syntax of Hungarian Noun Phrases. A Lexical-Functional Approach* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995); Tibor Laczkó, "A melléknévi és határozói igenévképzők" [Attributive and Absolute Participial Suffixes], in *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan 3.*, ed. Ferenc Kiefer (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2000), 409–51.; Tibor Laczkó, "Nominalization, participle formation, typology, and lexical mapping theory", in *Approaches to Hungarian 9.*, ed. Christopher Piñon and Péter Siptár (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2005), 207–230.; Ildikó Tóth, "VA- and VÁN-participles in Hungarian", in *Approaches to Hungarian 7.*, ed. Gábor Alberti and István Kenesei

the participle+copula construction, all those factors that can constrain the use of this construction in present day standard Hungarian seem to be listed.

In this article we will analyse the predicative participle constructions (PPC) in the most archaic dialect of Hungarian, the Csángó dialect spoken in Moldova, the north-eastern part of Romania. As data shows, in this dialect the participle+copula constructions are both more productive and more diverse than in standard Hungarian: first (i) as far as argument structure is concerned, verbs that cannot be the input for standard Hungarian PPC formation are available in this dialect, second (ii) oblique agents are generally allowed, third (iii) the construction allows for an eventive reading (shown by its compatibility with event-related adverbs, fourth (iv) the range of atelic verbs that can be inputs to PPC formation is wider than in standard Hungarian.

The article is structured as follows: based on previous literature, Section **1** presents the PPC, its functions and the input constraints; following a brief presentation of the corpus, Section **2** discusses four features contrasting standard Hungarian data with data from the Csángó dialect; after some concluding remarks on the comparison in 2, Section **3** focuses on the regularities behind the four features mentioned (advancing explanations for those phenomena that present a difficulty for current theories); finally, Section **4** summarizes the results.

1. The construction

1.1. Formal and semantic characteristics

PPCs involve some form of the copula (*van/volt/lesz/lett*)[1] and the participle of a verb. The participial suffix is *-vA* (where the capital letter conflates the surface realizations *-va/-ve* of the suffix, determined by vowel harmony). If the input verb has a preverb (PV), in neutral sentences it surfaces in front of the copula.

Though the meaning of PPC is also dependent on the form of the copula that appears in the construction, as a rule it denotes a state that results from the event described by the input verb. The subject of the construction is interpreted as the subject of the result state:

(1) a. *A plakát le van/volt/ lesz/ lett tépve.*
the poster PV_{down} is/ was/ will.be/ has (had) become tear-vA
'The poster is/was/will be/got torn off.'
b. *A plakát le van/ volt/ ?lesz[2]/ *lett esve.*

(Szeged: JATE, 2000), 239–56.; Andrea Márkus, *Participles and the passive in Hungarian* (MA diss., ELTE, 2008); Boglárka Németh, *A predikatív határozói igeneves szerkezetek. Egy aspektuális megközelítés* [The predicative adverbial participial constructions in Hungarian. An aspectual approach] (MA diss., BBU, 2007).

[1] The copula *van* is the present tense 3SG form of 'be', *volt* is the past tense 3SG, *lesz* is the future 3SG ('will.be'), while *lett* is the past tense 3SG form of 'be-become' (that is a 'be', with the overtone of 'become'). *Lesz* and *volt* are ambiguous; the former is also the present tense 3SG form (interpreted as future) of a perfective copula, with *lett* representing its past tense 3SG form, while the latter is frequently used also as a synonym of the copula *lett*.

[2] While the problem of *lesz* (BE.fut + *V-vA*) is more complex (and not yet fully clarified), here it suffices to say that the acceptability of the sentence improves if an adverb specifying reference time is added:
(i) *(Szerintem ez nem jó ragasztó, meglátod,) a plakát estére le lesz esve.*

the poster PV_{down} is/ was/ will.be/ has (had) become fall-vA
'The poster is/was/will be/*got fallen.'

c. **Péter győzve van/ volt/ lesz/ lett.*
Peter win-vA is/ was/ will.be/ has (had) become
'Peter has (lit. is/was/will be/got) won.'

As there is a single entry with *lett* in the dialect corpus, on the level of examples we will focus on the *van/volt/lesz + V-vA* pattern. In the following we will use the notation VAN + *V-vA* to refer to any/all of these lexical items (*van/volt/lesz*), and LETT any/all of the lexical items *lett/volt/lesz*.

1.2. Input conditions

Various ideas were put forward in the literature to account for the differences in the acceptability of the examples in (1). The first and most obvious one relates its well-formedness to the argument structure of the input verb: while the verb *letép* ('tears off') in (1a) is transitive, in (1b) and (1c) we have an unergative and an unaccusative base verb, respectively. The generalization of the literature based on examples like those in (1) is that PPCs can only be created out of verbs that have a (deep) object in their argument structure. What transitive and unaccusative verbs have in common is an argument with theme/patient semantic role. The patient can be defined as the entity undergoing a change of state or location or that is affected by an event. Thus in a construction that describes a result state, the theme/patient role is of central importance.

That the need for an appropriate argument structure is not a sufficient (and maybe not even a necessary) condition for PCC formation can be seen in examples like those in (2). Both (2a) with the transitive input verb *meglát* ('spots') and (2b) with the unaccusative *megsemmisül* ('perishes') are ungrammatical. (2c) shows that the presence of an argument with a theme thematic role is not compulsory either: *elutazik* ('fares forth') is an agentive (unergative) verb.

(2) a. **A gyerek meg volt látva, amint éppen betört egy ablakot.*
the child PV_{perf} was see-vA as just broke a window-ACC
'The child was (being) seen while breaking a window.'

b. **A templom meg van semmisülve.*
the church PV_{perf} is perish-vA
'The church is (=has) perished.'

c. %*A férjem el van utazva.*
the husband-Poss.1SG PV_{away} is travel-vA
'My husband is (lit. travelled) away.'

Another problem is that of productivity: the construction is not unrestrictedly productive either in the range of transitive verbs or in that of unaccusatives (cf. (3)–(4)). An explanation for this can be sought in the thematic role of the arguments of the input verb: in (3a) the subject of the transitive verb (Mari) is not agentive, but an experiencer,

---

'(I think that this is not good glue, you'll see) the poster will have fallen by tonight.'
For more on this topic see Bene, *Az igék bennható–mediális–tranzitív felosztásának alkalmazhatósága...*

thus, even if there is a change of state, that affects the experiencer not the patient. That it is not the case that experiencers cannot be subjects of PPCs, is exemplified in (3b).

(3) a. **A szomszédok meg vannak/ voltak ismerve*.
the neighbours PV_{perf} are-3PL/ were-3PL know-vA
'The neighbours are/were known.' (cf. Mary got acquainted with the neighbours.)
b. *Mari meg van hatódva (a kedvességedtől).*
Mary PV_{perf} is overcome-vA (the kindness-Poss2SG-from)
'Mary is moved by your kindness.'

Another constraint on productivity could be aspectual. Regarding the situation aspect,[1] it seems that from the telic/atelic pair it is only the former that results in a grammatical PPC (cf. (4a) and (4b)). This is in obvious correlation with the fact that the construction is specialized in describing a result state. However, as (4c) shows, the telicity of the input verb is not a sufficient condition of grammatical output.

(4) a. **Égetve van a levél.* (atelic)
burn-vA is the letter
'The letter is (being) burnt.'
b. *El van égetve a levél.* (telic)
PV_{off} is burn-vA the letter
'The letter has been burnt.'
c. *A *csúcs el van érve.* (telic)
the hill.top PV_{off} is reach-vA
'The top of the hill is (=has been) reached.'

Our examples illustrate that ***typically*** there are two constraints on the input verb that, if satisfied, lead to a grammatical PPC: one is aspectual (it has to be telic), and the other regards its argument structure (it must have a patient argument). However, as indicated above, neither telicity, nor the existence of a patient argument is a sufficient or even necessary condition for a well formed PPC. Moreover, in some cases grammaticality judgements are not uniform throughout the speech community, cf. (5a–c):

(5) a. %*Péter meg van gyógyítva*.
Peter PV_{perf} is $heal_{tr}$-vA
'Peter is cured.'
b. %*Az órám magától meg van javulva*.
the watch-Poss.1SG itself-from PV_{perf} is $mend_{intr}$-vA
'My watch $mended_{intr}$ spontaneously.'
c. %*A kollegám el van menve pénzt váltani.*
the colleague-Poss.1SG PV_{away} is go-vA money-ACC change-Inf
'My colleague is gone to change some money.'

[1] For details on actionality and situation aspect see Carlota Smith, *The Parameter of Aspect* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1991).

It seems that there are not only syntactic but also semantic and pragmatic factors regulating the acceptability of the construction. Some of the constraints are the visibility/spectacularity of the result state (cf. (6c) with (6a,b)), the durability of the result state (cf. (7a) with (7b)), or whether the result state is somehow qualitatively different or is just the result of a change of state (cf. (8a,b) with (8c,d)). Moreover, grammaticality judgements can be influenced by the degree of affectedness of the patient (fully affected/partially affected/unaffected – cf. (9a–c)), the extent of the chance of state (partial/full – cf. (10a–c)), the presence or absence of an agent (cf. (11a,b)), etc.[1]

(6) a. ?[2]*A könyv ki van olvasva.*
the book PV_{out} is read-vA
'The book is finished.'
b. ??*A könyv el van olvasva.*
the book PV_{off} is read-vA
'The book is (=has been) read.'
c. *A könyv el van rongyolódva.*
the book PV_{off} is frazzle-vA
'The book is frazzled.'

(7) a. ??*A labda fel van dobva a háztetőre.*
the ball PV_{up} is throw-vA the roof-on
'The ball is thrown on the roof.'
b. *A labda ki van pukkanva.*
the ball PV_{out} is pop-vA
'The ball is punctured.'

(8) a. *A levél megérkezett.*
the letter PV_{perf}-arrived
'The letter has arrived.'
b. ??*A levél meg van érkezve.*
the letter PV_{perf} is arrived
'The letter is arrived.'
c. *Kivasaltam az inged (de már biztos/ lehet, hogy összegyűrődött).*
PV_{out}-ironed-1SG the shirt-Poss.2SG (but already sure/ perhaps that PV-crinkled)
'I had ironed your shirt (but it is sure/possible that is has crinkled by now).'

[1] For a full list of constraints see Judit Kertész, *Eseményszerkezet, aspektus, mondatszerkezet. A predikatív határozói igenevek.* [Event structure, aspect, clause structure: the predicative adverbial participles] (MA diss., ELTE, 2005).

[2] Some of these sentences are standard examples circulated in the literature (cf. László Grétsy and Miklós Kovalovszky, ed., *Nyelvművelő kézikönyv* I. [Handbook of correct usage] (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1980); Alberti, "Passziválási művelet a magyarban"; Alberti, "On passivization in Hungarian", Kertész, *Eseményszerkezet, aspektus, mondatszerkezet...*, Bartos, "The syntax of Hungarian *-vA* adverbial participles..."). The grammaticality judgements reflect their acceptability in standard Hungarian even in those cases when the examples are our own (and even if it would fall under other adjudication in our dialect).

d. *Ki van vasalva az inged.*
PV_{out} is iron-vA the shirt-Poss.2SG
'You shirt is ironed.'

(9) a. *A váza össze van törve.*
the vase PV is break-vA
'The vase is broken to pieces.'
b. *Az autóm össze van törve.*
the car-Poss.1SG PV is break-vA
'My car is crashed broken.'
c. ???*A könyv meg van pillantva.*
the book PV_{perf} is glance-vA
'The book is caught sight of.'

(10) a. *A ház meg van rongálva.*
the house PV_{perf} is damage-vA
'The house is damaged.'
b. ?*A ház fel van építve.*
the house PV_{up} is build-vA
'The house is (=has been) built up.'
c. ??*A ház fel van robbanva.*
the house PV_{up} is $detonate_{unacc}$-vA
'The house is blown up.'

(11) a. ?*A vonat el van indítva.*
the train PV_{off} is $start_{tr}$-vA
'The train is (=has been) started.'
b. **A vonat el van indulva.*
the train PV_{off} is $start_{intr}$-vA
'The train is (=has) started.'

The above examples indicate that it is both hopeless and useless trying to give an account of the – seemingly „extra-syntactic" – constraints at work here with the toolkit of syntax. What seems to be a more adequate approach is to allow overgeneration in syntax, and let semantic/pragmatic filters sort out the grammatical outputs (cf. Bartos' account).

1.3. Passive or (just) resultative?

As it was formerly mentioned, the main function of the PPC is to present a state as a result of an event (and additionally to avoid the expression of the agent argument, cf. *A dolog el van intézve.* the thing PV_{off} is arrange-vA 'The problem is fixed.'). Resultativity relates to both telicity (PPC is generated out of telic input verbs) and stativity (we get a state reading at the output) (see also section **3.2.2.** and **3.2.3.**). In the literature the analysis of the PPC as a resultative construction competes with considering it a passive. Passivization – in classical terms – is a structure changing procedure, operating on transitive verbal input that changes the mapping of arguments to grammatical functions: the patient argument is promoted by assigning a subject function to it, while the agent is

suppressed, thus it can only surface as an adjunct with an oblique case marker (*X-től*) or postposition (*X által*).

As we have seen above, the PPC differs in many respects from the English-type passive: it has a relatively low productivity (its productivity is not absolute even with transitive input verbs, and it is only a subclass of intransitives that can appear in it); its meaning is limited to a change of state meaning, to a description of a (result) state; intransitive verbs can be the input of PPC formation, and in this case there is no argument structure change; there are aspectual constraints at work with regard to the input verb, etc. In order to dissolve this discrepancy the literature came up with various solutions. The analysis of the PPC as involving passivization is mainly advanced by lexicalist approaches,[1] but this is what we find in the syntactic approach presented by Márkus as well.

The opposite position is taken by Tóth and Bartos. The PPC is considered by Tóth to be a stative resultative. The patient promoting operation at work with transitive input verbs is not viewed as a symptom of passivization, but it is considered to be motivated by case assignment (in the domain of the copula it is only the Nominative case that is available);[2] this can also account for the fact that out of the two arguments of a transitive verb only one can surface in the construction under discussion. The author assumes a single *-vA* suffix that has some well defined, constant lexical properties, and it can appear in various constructions depending on the place of its insertion. *-vA* is generated as a sister of the VP (in a separate projection of its own) and it is the complement of a zero affix in the head of Asp. This zero aspectual suffix is responsible for converting process predicates (*verbal participles*) into states (*resultative participles*). In this approach the distinctive feature of the construction VAN + *V-vA* expressing a result state is that the participial suffix is attached to the predicate in a position below VoiceP, and therefore neither the agent argument can be expressed, nor is an Accusative case available, thus in case of transitive verbs one of the arguments cannot be expressed syntactically. The resultative reading is due to the aforementioned *Ø* aspectual suffix, and the copula is needed in order to provide a host for the morphemes of person, number and tense (which makes the assignment of Nominative case possible).

The analysis put forward by Bartos closely resembles the one presented by Tóth. He also assumes a single *-vA* suffix that can be inserted at several points in the extended projection of the predicate. The place of insertion has consequences both for the further projection of the predicate and its arguments, and for the available interpretations. Bartos assumes that all predicates are syntactically structured as shown in (12). Each atomic component is represented by a separate syntactic head, and introduces at most

[1] Cf. András Komlósy, "Régensek és vonzatok" [Regents and arguments], in *Strukturális magyar nyelvtan. 1. Mondattan*, ed. Ferenc Kiefer (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1992), 229–527.; András Komlósy, "Complements and Adjuncts", in *Syntax and Semantics 27. The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*, ed. Ferenc Kiefer and Katalin É. Kiss (New York: Academic Press, 1994), 91–178.; Alberti, "Passziválási művelet a magyarban"; Alberti, *Argument Selection*; Alberti, "On passivization in Hungarian"; Laczkó, *The Syntax of Hungarian Noun Phrases...*; Laczkó, "A melléknévi és határozói igenévképzők"; Laczkó, "Nominalization, participle formation..."

[2] Based on Kratzer the theory assumes that the external (agent) argument is introduced in the specifier of a separate functional head (Voice) above VP, and that this Voice head is also responsible for the assignment of Accusative case.

one argument of the whole predicate: the ROOT is responsible for the innermost argument (in case of transitive and unaccusative verbs), little *v* is the verbalizing morpheme (since roots are category neutral), CAUS introduces the notion of causation (agentivity) into the compositional structure, and finally Voice closes off the projection of the entire predicate by adding the external argument (in case of transitive and unergative verbs). The insertion of *-vA* at any point precludes the further projection of the structure.

(12) [(*external argument*) Voice [CAUS[v[√ROOT (*internal argument*)]]]][1]

According to Bartos the reason for having only transitive and unaccusative verbs as inputs for PCC formation can be found in the fact that unergative verbs "truncated" by *-vA* cannot have their external argument projected. This is the point at which PCCs and passives meet: no external argument is projected, there is no Accusative case for the internal argument, and the subject position becomes available for the internal argument.

As for the *-vA* that makes up a PCC with the copula, Bartos assumes an insertion point above little *v* and below CAUS (for transitive and unacusative input verbs), and above CAUS and below Voice (for transitive input verbs only). The internal argument of the input verb will get a Nominative case rising to the subject position of the sentence built on the copula.

Our analysis resembles at some points both Tóth's and that of Bartos.

2. The properties of the PPC in the Csángó dialect

2.1. The corpus

The corpus contains about half a million words of spoken Csángó, which is the most archaic dialect of Hungarian. The Hungarian language went through a renewal in the 18th–19th centuries, but this did not affect the language of the Csángós. The geographical dispersion of the Csángó settlements and their relative isolation resulted in a non-homogeneous language. The oldest sub-dialect, northern Csángó, preserves numerous elements of the Hungarian language of the late Middle Ages. The southern Csángó and Székely-Csángó sub-dialects are less archaic, and all sub-dialects show the influence of Romanian, specific to that language area.

Out of the settlements where the northern Csángó dialect is spoken, we only have data from Săbăoani. The bulk of the approx. 1600 pages of transcribed interviews were recorded in Székely-Csángó-speaking settlements (such as Lespezi, Gârleni, Luizi-Călugăra, Fărăoani, Cleja, Şomuşca, Valea Mică, Gheorghe Doja, Ciucani, Fundul Răcăciuni, Arini, Vladnic, and Chetriş along the Siret valley; Frumoasa, Pustiana and Tărâța along the Tazlău valley; respectively Nicoreşti and Bahna along the Trotuş valley). Apart from the village of Nicolae Bălcescu, we also have interviews from all of the southern Csángó settlements, where this dialect of Hungarian is still spoken (namely Pădureni, Valea Seacă, Galbeni, Gioseni and Valea Mare).

[1] Bartos, "The syntax of Hungarian *-vA* adverbial participles...", 19.

Our resources were as follows:[1] data collected and transcribed by students of ethnography major and minor in 2005 (138,471 words); Zsuzsa Ivácsony's deep interviews recorded and transcribed between 2002–2003 (50,305 words); the volume entitled *Moldvai csángó legendárium*[2] containing data recorded by students of ethnography major and minor in 2001 (212,585 words); interviews conducted as background to identity research by Vilmos Tánczos between 1993–1995 (19,577 words); transcribed files of survey data providing the basis of the volume *A moldvai csángók vallásossága*[3] by Lehel Peti (41,559 words); and finally the appendix of the volume *Elszakasztottad a testemtől én lelkemet*[4] by István Virt (74,564 words), containing interview fragments in a thematic set-up.

2.2. The data

While all types of participle constructions that are grammatical in standard Hungarian can also be found in our database, still it is by far the most frequent function of the participle to appear in a copula construction in these texts. There are about 1500 items of PPCs of the form VAN + *V-vA*. It is difficult to estimate what this number means in terms of frequency, as we have no collection of transcribed spoken language data from standard Hungarian that could be comparable to our database, and it is not clear, whether there could be a significant difference in frequency of PPCs in written and spoken language. What can be asserted, however, is that the number of occurence of PPCs in our Csángó corpus and the Hungarian National Corpus (HNC), respectively, differ by one and a half order of magnitude. The database of approx. 160 million words of the HNC gives a hit list of 13,674 entries for VAN + *V-vA* (date of query: spring 2005). This means that while in the Csángó texts we find a PCC for every 365 word, in the HNC it is only for every 11,700 word that a PPC occurs. This frequency index supports the conclusion that the use and function of the PPC in the Csángó dialect is wider than it is in standard Hungarian.

The 1472 items of PPCs of our database includes 600 different verbs. (We took every preverb+verb combination for a different lexical item.) In what the share of the three verb types is concerned we find the following approximative rates: transitive verbs 60%, unaccusatives 25%, unergatives 15%. (Partially) due to the topic of the texts the most frequent verbs are *meghal* 'PV_{perf}-dies' (144 occurences), *elmegy* 'PV_{away}-goes' (57 occurences) and *csinál* 'makes/does' (41 occurences). As for its form, the PPCs of the Csángó dialect can appear both with the standard Hungarian suffix *-vA*, and the more archaic *-vAl*,[5] the latter representing cca. 9% of the occurences. Since there is no

[1] Much of the sources used are from the data archives of the János Kriza Ethnographical Society (JKES). Special thanks are due to Sándor Ilyés from the JKES, and to Lehel Peti for putting the transcribed interviews at our disposal.

[2] *Moldvai csángó legendárium* [Legends of Csángós of Moldova] (Cluj: János Kriza Ethnographical Society, 2007).

[3] *A moldvai csángók vallásossága* [The religious life of the Moldavian Csángós] (Budapest: Lucidus, 2008).

[4] *Elszakasztottad a testemtől én lelkemet* [You've torn apart my soul from my body] (Cluj: János Kriza Ethnographical Society, 2001).

[5] The *-vAl* form of the suffix can be documented from Gioseni (among the southern Csángó settlements), but it can also be found in all the three subgroups of the Székely-Csángó sub-dialect-speaking area (Chetriş, Lespezi, Luizi-Călugăra, Arini; Frumoasa; Nicoreşti). This form

functional, semantic, syntactic etc. difference between the VAN + *V-vA* and the VAN + *V-vAl* template, therefore we will stick to the VAN + *V-vA* notation covering both cases.

2.3. Prominent features of the Csángó PPC

The data of the corpus show a series of notable differences from standard Hungarian examples dealt with in the literature. Nevertheless in the following sections we will only focus on the four factors along the line of which standard Hungarian and the Csángó data diverge most significantly:

1. the possibility of unergative input verbs;
2. the optional appearance of an oblique agent;
3. licensing atelic input verbs;
4. the availability of eventive reading of the output.

2.3.1. Unergative verbs

On the basis of the grammaticality judgements associated with the examples circulated in the literature we can conclude that standard Hungarian does not allow PPCs built on unergative input verbs.[1] Nevertheless, in the Csángó dialect (and with some constraints even in our dialect) PPCs having an unergative base verb are grammatical. The fact that unergative verbs can be inputs to PPC formation of the VAN + *V-vA* type is a problem for both those who analyse the construction as passive (as there is no patient argument to prefer) and for Tóth's and Bartos' accounts (as in their model the *-vA* suffix is inserted under Voice that is responsible for the introduction of the external argument and for the availability of Accusative case, thus the projection hosting the external argument cannot even be built).

(that also exists in several other dialects of present-day Hungarian) is very frequent in the late Old Hungarian, and appears in early codices as well. The *-vAl* form is dated from late Old Hungarian, when the vowel of the *-vA* suffix had already been shortened. The *-l* element of the morpheme is taken to be an adverbial suffix, and the emergence of this form seems to be a result of the analogical effect of the instrumental-comitative *-vAl*, respectively of the synonymy of *sírva mond* (cry-vA say 'says it crying') ~ *sírással mond* (crying-with say 'says it with crying') (cf. Anna Jászó, "Az igenevek" [Non-finite verb forms], in *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana 1*., ed. Loránd Benkő (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1991), 319–52, 349.). This explanation seems to be backed up (at least for the Csángó dialect) with the fact that the *v* of the instrumental-comitative *-vAl* still does not assimilate to the last consonant of the root, e.g. *szekervel* 'with a cart', *szenteltvízvel* 'with holy water' etc. (cf. standard Hungarian *szekérrel, szenteltvízzel*).

[1] With respect to examples such as that in (i), Bartos mentions in a footnote (cf. Bartos, "The syntax of Hungarian *-vA* adverbial participles...", fn. 19) that they are not morphosyntactically ill-formed (that is in principle they can be derived by morphosyntactic rules), but semantically/pragmatically inappropriate (as they predicate a state of an external argument), therefore it is the task of a pragmatic filter to sort these out. However, examples such as (i) can only be inserted in his model with the stipulation that the subject is an "occasional internal argument", that is, such constructions are not built on genuine unergatives but on "occasional unergative-turned-unaccusatives" (cf. Bartos, "The syntax of Hungarian *-vA* adverbial participles...", 24).

(i) *%Laci el van utazva/ fel van mászva a fára.*
Laci PV_{away} is travel-vA/ PV_{up} is climb-vA the tree-on
'Laci is (lit. travelled) away. / Laci is (lit. climbed) up the tree.'

It is a question, however, whether there exist real (telic) unergative verbs in Hungarian, and whether the examples found in the literature with input verbs labelled as unergative can really be considered to be unergatives.

In present-day standard Hungarian it is the system of preverbs that is responsible for marking telicity. The resultative and terminative preverbs refer to the state of the object of the action (cf. transitive verbs) or the subject of the event (cf. unaccusative verbs) that sets in as a result of the action/event. É. Kiss analyses the preverb as a secondary predicate having the internal argument of the verb as its logical subject. Therefore a preverb always implies a constituent with a patient (or theme) thematic role.[1]

Unergative verbs were defined above as intransitive verbs with an agent argument. We have also seen that the PPC needs a telic input verb, and that it is verbs with resultative or terminative preverbs that are suitable for this task. So if we accept the approach outlined by É. Kiss, then an intransitive agentive verb having a preverb cannot qualify as unergative,[2] as it is only a predicate expressing the change of state or location of its patient that can be telic and can have a preverb.

Based on independent evidence, Levin and Rappaport[3] find that verbs of motion come in two guises: process verbs denoting the manner of motion are agentive (*utazik* 'travels'*, másszik* 'crawls/climbs'), while verbs that combine with a terminative element

---

[1] Cf. Katalin É. Kiss, "Egy igekötőelmélet vázlata" [An outline of a theory of preverbs], *Magyar Nyelv* 100 (2004): 15–42.

[2] É. Kiss assumes even for predicates as those in (i)–(iii) that they describe events that include some implied or semantically reconstructable patient argument, about which the preverbs predicates:

(i) *János belerúgott a kutyába.*
John PV_{into}-kicked the dog-into
'John (has) kicked at the dog.'

(ii) *Péter ránézett Évára.*
Peter PV_{at}-looked Eve-at
'Peter (has) looked at Eve.'

(iii) *Péter rászólt/ ráköszönt/ rámosolygott Évára.*
Peter PV_{at}-say/ PV_{at}-greet/ PV_{at}-smile Eve-at
'Peter called at/ greeted / smiled at Eve.'
(É. Kiss, "Egy igekötőelmélet vázlata", 32.)

That these verbs (unlike verbs expressing directed motion) should be treated on a par with transitives can also be seen from their distinct behaviour in PCCs: while the subject of *elutazik* (PV_{off}-travel 'departs') maintains its subject function in the output construction, the verb *belerúg* (PV_{into}-kick 'kicks into sthing') of example (i) becomes impersonal:

(iv) %*Péter el van utazva*.
Peter PV_{away} is travel-vA
'Peter is (lit. travelled) away.'

(v) %*A kerekekbe bele van rúgva*.
the tires-in PV_{into} is kick-vA
'The tires are kicked.'

(v) becomes interpretable given a scenario in which someone works in a tire factory, and he has to kick all the tires before he can go home (cf. David Embick, "On the Structure of Resultative Participles in English", *Linguistic Inquiry* 35/3 (2004): 355–392.).

[3] Beth Levin and Malka Rappaport Hovav, *Unaccusativity. At the syntax–lexical semantics interface* (Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1995).

in Hungarian become verbs of directed motion, and their subject becomes patient-like, which means that they start to behave like unaccusatives (*elutazik* PV_{away}-travel 'departs'*, felmászik* PV_{up}-climb 'climbs up').[1]

But even if the agentive preverb-verb complexes in the Csángó examples of (13) are to be taken for unaccusatives at some level of representation, it is indisputable that these verbs cannot be used as inputs to PPC formation in standard Hungarian, while in the Csángó dialect (and partially in our own dialect, too) are fully productive.

(13) a. *Volt egy szomszédja, el volt menve sok időtől.*
was a neighbour-Poss.3SG PV_{away} was go-vA many time-from
'He had a neighbour, he had been gone for a long time.'

b. *Mük nem voltunk ki hegyre, adică ['vagyis']*[2] *nem hogy nem, ki*
we not were-2PL PV_{out} hill-on rather not that not PV_{out}
voltunk a hegyre, de bé voltunk jőve a hegyről.
were the hill-on but PV_{in} were-2PL come-vA the hill-from
'We were not on the hill, I mean, it's not that we had not been, but we were back from the hill.'

c. *Le voltam oda ülve.*
PV_{down} was-1SG there sit-vA
'I was sitting there.'

d. *Együtt az egész* ['mindenki']. *Körbe vagyunk állva, s az egész*
together the whole ('everybody') $PV_{round\text{-}in}$ are-1PL stand-vA, and the whole
imádkozik.
prays
'Everybody is together. We are standing in a circle, and everyone prays.'

e. *Mind itt a szomszédba egy asszony látta, hogy jönnek,*
like here the neighbour-in a woman saw that come-3PL
a férje el volt futva hazulnét.
the husband-Poss.3SG PV_{away} was run-vA from.home
'As here in the neighbourhood a woman saw that they are coming, her husband was (=has) run away from home.'

f. *Met aszonta, hogy mikor jő visszafelé, met a ment,*
because said that when comes back-wards because that went
valamerre el vót indulva.
somewhere PV_{off} was start-vA
'Because he said that when he comes back (because he left, he was (=has) started in some direction...).'

Beyond the examples in (13) we can also find PPCs with intransitive input verbs with no preverb (cf. (14)) in the Csángó dialect, however, these are either verbs of

[1] Based on tests, Bene classifies Hungarian verbs of directed motion (*érkezik* 'arrives'*, halad* 'progresses'*, jön* 'comes'*, megy* 'goes' etc.), and verbs of spatial configuration (*feláll* 'stands up'*, rá/ át/ fel/ kiül* 'sits on something/ changes seat/ sits up on something/ sits in front of something'*, le/ ráfekszik* 'lies down/ lies over something') as unaccusatives.

[2] In the examples cited square brackets are used to give the Hungarian translation of the preceding Romanian (loan) word/expression, or to disambiguate meanings.

directed motion or verbs of spatial configuration that (following Bene) are also unaccusative.[1]

(14) a. *Extraterestuk [földönkívüliek], tudod, hogy mondják, hogy más*
UFO-s know-2SG how say-3PL that other
fődről vannak jövel.
place-form are-3PL come-vA
'UFOs, you know, how they say, they are (came) from other planets.'

b. *...vagyan messze menve egy leánya, káttő van Bukurestbe.*
is far go-vA a girl-Poss.3SG two is Bucharest-in
'There is a daughter of hers gone far away, two (other daughters) are in Bucharest.'

c. *Megállítom megálltak, s felvettek, s*
PV_{perf}-stopped-1SG PV_{perf}-stopped-3PL and PV_{up}-picked-3PL and
megkérdték merrefelé vagyunk utazva, s én megneveztem.
PV_{perf}-asked-3PL whereabout are-1PL travel-vA and I PV_{perf}-named-1SG
'I've stopped them, they've stopped and picked me up, and asked where we were travelling to, and I named it.'

d. (Álmodtam az édesanyámat, azt mondta, kell neki egy kiló édes tej.)
S a diszpenzárnál [orvosi rendelőnél] lett volna, s még
and the doctor's.office-at be-PAST be-COND, and yet
más asszonyok is, s volt feküve, s azt mondja:
other women also and was lie-vA and that-ACC say-3SG:
(– Kellett volna egy kiló édes tej nekem.)
'(I was dreaming about my mother, she told me that she needed a liter of sweet milk.) And (as if) it would have been at the doctor's office, and (there were) other women, too, and she was lying, and she said: (I would have needed a liter of sweet milk.)'

Levin and Rappaport conclude on the basis of language-specific tests that the boundary between the two classes of intransitive verbs can be drawn at different points for different languages. Thus it can also be conceivable that verbs of directed motion and verbs of spacial configuration can be classed differently across dialects of Hungarian; in those dialects where these verbs qualify as unaccusatives, the PPCs that have these as input verbs, would be grammatical.

2.3.2. Oblique agent

An oblique agent appears when the input verb lacks the projection introducing an external argument, but on lexical-semantic level it assigns an agent thematic role. As it can be reconstructed on the basis of the examples circulated in the literature (e.g. those presented by Alberti, Laczkó and Bene), standard Hungarian does not allow for an oblique agent, that is, there is no possibility to express the agent argument of the input

[1] Although in this article we will stick to Bene's classification, and we will consider these verbs unaccusatives, in a long run it seems to be a promising path to compare the syntax and semantics of reflexive verbs with the verbs dealt with here.

verb with an oblique (*-tÓl*) marked argument or a *by*-phrase (i.e. with the postposition *által*):[1]

(15) *A ruha ki van mosva (*Erzsi által/ *Erzsitől).*
the cloth PV_{out} is wash-vA (Erzsi by/ Erzsi-from)
*'The dress is washed by Erzsi.'

Tóth draws attention to examples such as (16) with verbs of creation, but she notes that these cannot be taken for canonical agentive *by*-phrases as they are used to qualify the surface subject, more precisely the *by*-phrase characterizes either the syntactic subject or the result state (cf. *ez egy szakértő által megfogalmazott kérelem* 'this is a petition worded by an expert').[2]

(16) *A kérelem szakértő által van megfogalmazva.*
the petition expert by is PV_{perf}-compose-vA
'The petition is worded by an expert.'

Bartos considers examples like those in (16) as surface exceptions, while Márkus gets to the conclusion that it can affect the grammaticality of the sentence whether the oblique agent is in focus or in a (distributive) quantifier position. She sustains that *by*-phrases are not licensed with neutral VAN + *V-vA* participles (as opposed to LETT + *V-vA* constructions). This is consonant with Bene's approach, and gets its explanation in the fact that the *by*-phrase favours an eventive interpretation that is alien from the VAN + *V-vA* construction by definition. It is a question though whether these sentences have a neutral form at all.

Nevertheless, in the Csángó examples below the oblique agent is not restricted to those cases where it qualifies the syntactic subject.

(17) a. *Koporsó meg volt csinálva egy embertől magának,*
coffin PV_{perf} was make-vA a man-from himself-DAT

---

[1] Examples like those in (i) are grammatical, of course, but there the expression with the postposition *által* is not an (oblique) agent, but a constituent expressing cause, source, instrument or manner of the event. As such, it is allowed with unaccusative verbs (verbs lacking an agent argument) as well (cf. (ii), (iii)) (see also Osvaldo A. Jaeggli, "Passive", *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: (1986), 587–622.; Tóth, "VA- and VÁN- participles in Hungarian").

(i) a. *A leveleink futár által vannak kézbesítve.*
the letters-Poss.1PL courier through are-3PL hand-vA
'Our letters are delivered by a curier.'
b. *Péter nem a szavazók voksai által van bejuttatva a parlamentbe.*
Peter not the electors votes through is PV_{in}-admit-vA the parliament-in
'It is not by the votes of the electorate that Peter is admitted to the parliament.'

(ii) *Péter meg van hatódva (a kedvességünktől).*
Peter PV_{perf} is touch-vA the kindness-Poss.1PL-from
'Peter is touched by our kindness.'

(iii) *Péter be van rúgva (valamitől).*
Peter PV_{in} is kicked (something-from)
'Peter got drunk form something.'

[2] Cf. Tóth, "VA- and VÁN- participles in Hungarian", 242.

s vették Jézust, s belétették.
and took-3PL Jesus-ACC and PV_{into}-put-3PL
'The coffin was made by a man for himself, and they took (the body of) Jesus, and they put him in it.'

b. *Akár hogy es tőlem nincsen soha elfelejtve.*
any how also from-1SG is.not never PV_{off}-forget-vA
'Anyway, I never forget that (lit. It is never forgotten by me).'

c. *Ebbe a házba is mind tőlle vannak csinálva.*
this-in the house-in also all from-3SG are-3PL make-vA
'(All these things) are made by him in this house, too.'

d. (Sakan jöttek, sakan, kik felgyűtték a szokásokat. […])
Minden falu össze van járva tőllik.
every village PV is walk-vA from-3PL
'(There came many of them collecting ways and customs.) Every village is toured by them.'

e. *De mihaszna, met aszonta, meg van állítva a püspöktől.*
but what-use because told-3SG PV_{perf} is stop-vA the bishop-from
'But what's the use, because he told us that he was stopped by the bishop.'

Below we will explain the grammaticality of such examples in the Csángó dialect by a correlation of the PPCs with the copula *lett*, on the one hand and *van*, on the other.

2.3.3. Atelic input verb

While atelic verbs may serve as input to the English passive construction, which consequently may have an eventive interpretation, Hungarian PPCs seem to have a telicity requirement (for more on this see section **3.2.3.**). Although Bartos presents some examples of PPCs with atelic input verbs and stativized output predicates (cf. (18), (19)), these are classified as belonging to the low insertion domain, i.e. participles formed by insertion below CAUS. In this analysis CAUS is a head that introduces agentivity and eventivity into the structure, therefore it cannot account for the eventive reading of the examples. The PPCs in (18) describe processes and not result states, which is indicated by their compatibility with event-related time adverbials.

(18) a. *A szoba (épp) takarítva van.*
the room (just) clean-vA is
'The room is being cleaned (just now).'

b. *?A bajai szerelvény (ma) dízellel van vontatva.*
the Baja train (today) Diesel-with is haul-vA
'The Baja train is hauled with a Diesel today.'[1]

Moreover, the examples in (19) allow for adverbials of frequency and manner which also operate on event arguments.

(19) a. *Kati haja (mindig/gyakran) aranyfésűvel van fésülve.*
Kati hair-Poss.3SG (always/often) gold-comb-with is comb-vA

[1] Bartos, "The syntax of Hungarian -*vA* adverbial participles...", 23.

'Katie's hair is always/often combed with a golden comb.'

b. *Ezen a lemezen a jól ismert dal szokatlan*
this-on the record-on the well known song unusual
módon alt hangon van énekelve.
way-on alto voice-on is sing-vA
'On this record, the well-known song is sung by an alto voice.'[1]

The Csángó data show a surprisingly rich variety of atelic input predicates, which correlates with the availability of eventive interpretation (for details see section **2.3.4.** below) and can be related to the specific aspectual functions of the construction (cf. section **3.2.**).

(20) a. V*oltak olyan értelmes szavak használva, ameliket*
were-3PL such meaningful words use-vA which
mi a csángók nem használjuk.
we the Csángós not use-1PL
'There were such meaningful words used that we Csángós do not use.'

b. *Az es vót hajtva tőle, az én emberemtől,*
that also was chase-vA from-3SG the my man-Poss.1SG-from
örökké jött a dologról, italos vót.
always came the work-from ebrious was
'He/She was also chased by him, by my husband, he always came from work, he was drunk.'

c. *Én egy üdőbe, mikor volt a kommunisták, nagyan vótam üldözve,*
I a time-in when was the communists very.much was-1SG persecute-vA
mert jöttek Magyarországról, mert filmet csináltak.
because came-3PL Hungary-from because movie-ACC made-3PL
'Sometime ago when there were the communists (in power), I was persecuted a lot, because (people) came from Hungary (to me), because they were shooting a film.'

d. *Ha harguszsnak rá, vannak olyan asszonyok, hogy tesznek olyan*
if angry-3PL at-3SG are-3PL such women that put-3PL such
merkurt ['higanyt'] *italba, arra van mondva valamiféle.*
mercury drink-in that-on is speak-vA something
'If someone is angry with someone else, there are women (one can go to), who put mercury in a drink, and [magic words] are said above it.'

2.3.4. Eventive reading

As we have already discussed, there is a crucial difference between VAN + *V-vA* and LETT + *V-vA* PPCs: while the former is stative by definition, the latter has an eventive reading. We use Laczkó's examples below to illustrate this. The construction type represented by (21a) and (21b) only allows for a stative reading, (21c) is aspectually ambiguous, and (21d) allows for an eventive reading.

(21) a. *A fiú ki van/ volt/ lesz/ *lett fáradva*.

[1] Ibid., 24.

the boy PV_{out} is/ was/ will.be/ has (had) become exhaust-vA
'The boy is/was/will be/*got exhausted.'

b. *Az asztal le van festve.*
the table PV_{down} is paint-vA
'The table is/has been painted.'

c. *Az asztal le volt festve.*
the table PV_{down} was paint-vA
'The table was painted.'

d. *Az asztal le lesz/ lett festve.*
the table PV_{down} well.be/ has (had) become paint-vA
'The table will be/got painted.'[1]

In her analysis Tóth applies the common linguistic tests that can serve as supporting arguments for the stative reading of a predicate. The eventive interpretation of the PPC is excluded on the basis of the following features: incompatibility with the so-called frame adverbials,[2] like *egy perc alatt* 'in a minute'; adverbials denoting the event time assigned to a predicate, like *négy órakor* 'at four o'clock', can only be interpreted as referring to the time interval at which the resultant state holds and never to the event time of the input predicate; only those adverbials are allowed in these constructions that are compatible with stative predicates (e.g. *szépen* 'beautifully/nicely') and those applying to dynamic predicates (e.g. *gyorsan* 'quickly') result in ungrammatical constructions (e.g. **A levél gyorsan van megírva* 'The letter is written quickly' – *A levél szépen van megírva* 'The letter is nicely written'); the oblique representation of the agent is not allowed (with the exception of the examples presented in section **2.3.2.**); the affectedness principle holds: the subject of the input predicate undergoes a change of state.[3]

As Márkus points it out, the above mentioned factors do not produce ill-formed sentences in the case of LETT + *V-vA* PPCs. Her analysis presents some further arguments for distinguishing eventive LETT + *V-vA* PPCs from stative VAN + *V-vA* PPCs. The first one is based on the different readings triggered by the adverb *majdnem* 'almost', which support the validity of the eventivity–stativity opposition: with VAN + *V-vA* PPCs the adverb only allows for the so-called pseudo-resultative interpretation (e.g. *a példa majdnem ki van dolgozva* 'the example is almost worked out' can only mean that we have almost finished the activity), while the eventive LETT + *V-vA* PPC allows for both a pseudo-resultative and a counterfactual reading (e.g. *a példa majdnem ki lett dolgozva* 'the example is/was almost worked out' can either mean that we were engaged in an activity and almost accomplished it, or that we never actually started it). Another difference between the two types of copula constructions can be captured in the domain of control: as the examples in (22) show, in the case of PPCs formed with the copula *lett* there is an implicit agent that controls the PRO subject of the subordinate

[1] Laczkó, *The Syntax of Hungarian Noun Phrases...*, 190.
[2] Frame adverbials have a crucial role in distinguishing telic predicates from atelic ones, because only telic predicates allow for the presence of this type of adverbials. The test is reliable since all telic predicates are dynamic (therefore eventive). (Cf. Smith, *The Parameter of Aspect.*)
[3] Tóth, "VA- and VÁN- participles in Hungarian", 241–2.

clause, but for PPCs formed with the copula *van* no such agent is available. This pattern also supports the stativity–eventivity distinction of the two subtypes of PPCs.[1]

(22) a. **A hajó el volt süllyesztve, a biztosítást begyűjtendő.*
the ship PV_{off} was sink-vA the insurance-ACC PV_{in}-collect-fut.part.
'The ship was sunk to collect the insurance.'

b. *A hajó el lett süllyesztve, a biztosítást begyűjtendő.*
the ship PV_{off} has become sink-vA the insurance-ACC PV_{in}-collect-fut.part.
'The ship was sunk to collect the insurance.'[2]

The presented arguments lead to the conclusion that in standard Hungarian VAN + *V-vA* PPCs cannot have an eventive reading. Unlike standard Hungarian, the Csángó dialect allows for the eventive interpretation of the construction type. According to our data, there are several examples with VAN + *V-vA* PPCs that have an eventive reading.

(23) a. *Idefelé van meghalva, de mind kínlódva van*
hereabout is PV_{perf}-die-vA but always agonize-vA is
meghalva, s azétt es kerütték.
PV_{perf}-die-vA and therefore too shunned-3PL
'He has died over here, but he has died in pain, and that's why they shunned him.'

b. *Mikor meg volt halva Magda, erős szépen álmodtam akkor.*
when PV_{perf} was die-vA Magda strong beautifully dreamed-1SG then
'When Magda died I had a very beautiful dream.'

c. (S akkor menjenek keresztül a folyón, nagy zúgás történt. Mikor nézi, há né, egy szép asszon.)
Egyszer úgy – 18szor van megjelenve –, s ott a kőszikla volt.
once like.that for.18.times is PV_{perf}-appear-vA and there the cliff was
'(And when they were about to cross the river, they heard a loud roaring. When (s)he turns there, look, a beautiful woman.) Once it happened like that – she appeared for eighteen times (alltogether) – and there was the cliff.'

d. *Ő is mindig ki volt zavarva, de ő mindig visszament*
he also always PV_{out} was bundle-vA.off but he always PV_{back}-went
'He was also always bundled off, but he always went back.'

e. *S az idén kellett vegyünk hajmát*
and the this.year must-PAST buy-1PL onion-ACC
is, mert, ha el volt verve a jégtől, elrothadott.
also because if PV_{off} was hit-vA the hail-from PV_{off}-rotted
'This year we had to buy onion, too, because as it was cut up by the hail, it rotted.'

f. *Háromszor voltam felkőtve, hogy*
for.three.times was-1SG PV_{up}-wake-vA that
imádkozzam, az őrzőangyalomtól.
pray-Conj-1SG the guardian-angel-Poss.1SG-from

[1] Márkus, *Participles and the passive in Hungarian*, 20–27.
[2] Ibid., 23.

'I've been woken up for three times by my guardian angel in order to pray.'

Most of the examples in (23) contain circumstantial adverbs that trigger the eventive reading. This clearly presents a difficulty for the account presented by Bartos, because it predicts that event-related modifiers cannot be available at this level, since no eventive predicate can be formed yet. The prediction is based on the assumption that the lowest VP-layer generally denotes a state which cannot undergo any change (unless it gets related to another event), and it is also a theoretical necessity, eventivity being introduced into the structure at a higher level (CAUS). In the case of transitive verbs the affix *-vA* can also be introduced above CAUS, which means that eventivity and agentivity-related modifiers are allowed at this level (CAUS is defined as the head responsible for agentivity and eventivity). The examples in (24) show that intransitive verbs are excluded at this level.

(24) a. *A hús zsírban van megsütve/ *megsülve.*
the meat fat-in is PV_{perf}-fry_{tr}-vA/ PV_{perf}-fry_{unacc}-vA
'The meat has been fried in fat.'

b. *A festék forró levegővel van ?megszárítva/ *megszáradva.*
the paint hot air-with is PV_{perf}-dry_{tr}-vA/ PV_{perf}-dry_{unacc}-vA
'The paint has been dried with hot air.'

c. *A festék forró levegővel van szárítva.*
the paint hot air-with is dry_{tr}-vA
'The paint is being dried with hot air.'[1]

As far as standard Hungarian is concerned the generalization is the following: predicates formed by affixation below CAUS do not combine with circumstantial adverbs; unaccusative verbs cannot serve as input to *-vA* affixation above CAUS. As we have discussed, the Csángó dialect is different from standard Hungarian in this respect.

3. The principles and constraints of PPC formation: a comparative account

3.1. Standard Hungarian and Csángó PPCs

The data presented above show that Csángó PPCs can only partly be derived from constraints present in the standard use of the construction type, consequenly they cannot be accounted for by the current theories without some modifications. In the present section we deal with the constraints of PPC formation, and argue that a considerable part of the discussed features can be explained by the aspectual functions of the construction type. We also analyse the main factors of overgeneration, among which the influence of the Romanian language is a very important one.

3.2. Aspectual functions of PPCs in standard Hungarian

As it has been discussed in detail in section **1**, the literature is mostly concerned with the argument structure of the input predicate of PPCs. However, some aspectual criteria are also mentioned in all current accounts. Alberti analyses PPC formation as passivization, but when describing its function he presents the construction type as being "a substitute

[1] Bartos, "The syntax of Hungarian *-vA* adverbial participles...", 27.

for perfect aspect".[1] Tóth, on the other hand, argues against the passive approach, and notes that – although there seems to be a connection between resultatives, and the perfect and passive voice in various languages – in Hungarian resultativity was grammaticalized independently from the existence of the passive.[2] In her analysis she refers to the construction type as the *stative resultative*, and she notes that it can only be formed from perfective input verbs.

The linguistic data and the observations presented in the literature lead to the conclusion that the main function of PPCs is expressing resultativity, which is semantically related to the perfect aspect (e.g. the English *perfect*), accordingly the construction type **may be considered a partial equivalent or substitute for the perfect enriching the Hungarian tense-aspect system.**

In the rest of this subsection we take a closer look at the features and regularities relating PPCs to the perfect, and we present an aspectual account of the restricted productivity of the construction type and the argument structure shift of transitive input predicates.

3.2.1. The tense-aspect category of the perfect

Before presenting more detailed arguments for considering the Hungarian PPC a perfect-like construction, let us briefly touch upon a problematic issue related to the definition of the category of the perfect. Though many of the existing accounts on perfect do not address the issue, one of the most debated topics related to the perfect remains whether to define it as a relative tense or as an aspectual category. Since we do not intend to make a contribution to the clarification of this particular topic, we will only list some of the most common approaches and indicate what our conception of the term is.

A commonly known approach is the Reichenbachian one: categories like the (English) perfect are complex tenses, which, unlike simple/absolute tenses, imply three time points: the *point of speech*, the *point of event* and the *point of reference*. The latter was introduced in order to make the formal distinction of simple past and (present) perfect possible.[3]

Comrie notes that the perfect is essentially different from the other aspectual categories since it does not tell anything about the situation described by the predicate, and he emphasizes, without going into details, that it is an aspect in a different sense than the perfective and imperfective aspects.[4] Smith discusses the role of the perfect in the aspecto-temporal system in somewhat more detail. In her two-component theory of aspect she presents the perfect as a category related to specification of temporal location, which has specific aspectual characteristics, but does not constitute a viewpoint aspect category. She argues that the viewpoint of perfect sentences is generally perfective

[1] Alberti talks about "perfect aspect" which in the present context clearly refers to what the literature calls *the perfect*, and not to the *perfective aspect*, which is unanimously considered to be a viewpoint aspect category. For more on the definition of the perfect, see the rest of this subsection.

[2] Cf. Tóth, "VA- and VÁN- participles in Hungarian", 248.

[3] Hans Reichenbach, *Elements of Symbolic Logic* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947), 288.

[4] Bernard Comrie, *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems* (Cambridge: CUP, 1976), 52–65.

(meaning that the initial and final points of the situations are presented), but these sentences also have a stative value, because "they present a state of affairs with characteristics due to the prior situation".[1]

Klein defines aspect as the way in which the time of a situation is related to a given topic time (Klein's notion of topic time is generally regarded as the counterpart of Reichenbachian reference time), where the three main relational categories are *full inclusion, partial inclusion* and *exclusion*. The perfect represents the case when the situation time precedes the topic time, and it is defined as an aspectual category in terms of this theory.[2]

The standard Functional Grammar treatment of aspect is distinguishing different subtypes or areas of aspect. In this theory the perfect and its counterpart, the prospective (e.g. *Tom is going to do his homework.*) belong to the area of perspectival aspectuality, which relates an event to a temporal reference point.[3] Boland's alternative approach is to define all aspect markers as operators that "select the relevant parts of the temporal structure of a property or relation, including the pre- or post-state".[4] The author presents the perfect as an aspectual category that focusses on the post-state of an event.[5]

In this work we use the term *perfect* as referring to a category of (perspectival) aspect which relates the event described by the predicate to a temporal reference point. Thus we consider it an aspectual category with specific termporal reference features. The semantic features of the category that are relevant to our analysis are discussed in section **3.2.2.** and **3.2.3.**

3.2.2. The current relevance constraint

As we have mentioned before, the visibility of the resultant state and the degree of affectedness of the subject represent the crucial semantic/pragmatic criteria of PPC formation (see also section **1.2.**). These constraints can be rephrased in the following way: *the event expressed by the input predicate must have current relevance, or, more generally, relevance at the Reichenbachian reference time (R)*. This pragmatic constraint is not more accurate than the previous two, but it explains the diversity of grammaticality judgements and provides the possibility of formalization in terms of the Reichenbachian system. Moreover, it clarifies the aspectual function of the analysed construction type, since the so-called *current relevance constraint* is a common feature of PPCs and *the perfect* found in many languages.

Comrie, for instance, describes the perfect as indicating "the continuing present relevance of a past situation" and notes that the *perfect of result* represents the clearest manifestation of this pattern.[6] As Dahl and Hedin point it out, in the course of their discussion on the topic, the notion of current relevance has often been identified with

[1] Smith, *The Parameter of Aspect*, 47–8.
[2] Wolfgang Klein, *Time in Language* (London: Routledge, 1994), 99–119.
[3] Annerieke Boland, *Aspect, tense and modality: Theory, typology, acquisition* (Utrecht: LOT, 2006), 41.
[4] Ibid., 44.
[5] Ibid., 48.
[6] Comrie, *Aspect*, 56.

"the continuance of the result of a past event into the present",[1] which provides an overly narrow concept for the general description of the perfect.

In this paper, we adopt the alternative interpretation of current relevance proposed by Dahl and Hedin. They argue that current relevance should be applied as a graded concept with a range of possible delimitations, among which the continuance of the result is the strongest but not the only one.[2] Their examples presented in (25) below help us illustrate how the constraint works.

(25) a. *The Prime Minister has been killed*.
b. *The soldier has lost his gun*.
c. *The gong has sounded*.[3]

The sentences in (25a) and (25b) represent prototypical examples of the perfect of result due to the type of their base predicate. Verbs that describe an event that has a well-defined inherent result are frequently used in this type of construction, and that may be the reason why there is a tendency to identify the linguistically encoded inherent result with current relevance. The example in (25c) illustrates that this is not a reliable association, because other predicate types are also used in perfect constructions. The base predicate of (25c) denotes an event without any linguistically encoded inherent result, so, in the narrow sense, the continuance of the result is excluded. This supports the necessity to reinterpret the concept of current relevance as a graded one where the continuance of the result is also reinterpreted as "a condition on the discourse, in that the speaker portrays the consequences of an event as somehow essential to the point of what he is saying".[4]

3.2.3. The problem of restricted productivity and argument structure shift

All the relevant input constraints have been discussed so far, at this point we would like to focus on the correlation between the aspecto-temporal features and the productivity restrictions of PPCs. The telicity constraint[5] that holds for the input predicates of these constructions can be accounted for by an aspectual approach. The aspectual background of our approach is based on the theories presented by Dahl and Hedin, Comrie and Johanson.

Based on the specific PPC formation patterns and the listed semantic/pragmatic features **we argue that the Hungarian PPC is a perfect-like construction[6] which belongs to the category of the so-called *preaspectual* items**. Johanson describes the category in the following way: "Since there are diacronic developments leading from peripheral constructions without aspectotemporally determining force to highly grammaticalized viewpoint operators, we may in many cases speak of *preaspectual* items. They do not reach the degree of generalization expected from aspectotenses. (…)

[1] Östen Dahl and Eva Hedin, "Current relevance and event reference", in *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, ed. Östen Dahl (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), 385–402, 391.
[2] Ibid., 391.
[3] Ibid., 391–2.
[4] Ibid., 392.
[5] We have also presented some exceptional cases of PPCs with atelic input verbs in section **2.3.3.**
[6] In the literature the term *perfect-like* refers to the "relatives" of the perfect, mainly resultative constructions.

The more limited the applicability of a preaspectual marker is, the longer its way is to the status of a viewpoint operator."[1] This is the case of the Hungarian PPC: it has the essential semantic features of the resultative perfect, it is widely productive, but it cannot be identified with the category of the perfect.

Dahl and Hedin base their conception of grammaticalization on similar observations as Johanson. They note that "many perfect grams have their origin in resultative constructions, which have the 'continuance of the inherent result of a past event' as part of their meaning", and they also note that only a subclass of telic verbs (telic verbs with a well-defined result-state in their inherent meaning) can serve as input to the resultative constructions and the resultative perfect. Moreover, they interpret the grammaticalization of the perfect as the gradual process characterised by the diminishing of the significance of current relevance. As they point it out, this tendency holds for both the initial stage of grammaticalization (from resultatives to perfects) and the later stages (from perfects to other tense-aspect categories, e.g. perfectives or pasts).[2] Thus we conclude that restricted productivity[3] is a common and aspectually driven feature of resultative constructions, and it is, of course, clearly related to the argument structure of the input predicates of these constructions.

Based on Nedjalkov et al., Dahl describes the categories of resultatives and perfects as being closely related, pointing out that the main difference between the distribution patterns of the construction types lies in the combinability with temporal modifiers. He illustrates this by comparing the distribution patterns of the Swedish resultative construction and the Swedish perfect construction. Both constructions refer to states resulting from earlier events, but they differ in patterns of adverbial modification.

(26) a. *Han är fortfarande bortrest.*
'He is still away-gone.'
b. *??Han har fortfarande rest bort.*
'He has still gone away.'[4]

The resultative construction in (26a) allows for modification by the adverb *fortfarande* 'still', while the perfect in (26b) combined with the same adverb represents a marked/ungrammatical case. We may note that the difference between the examples is that the first one is stative, while the second one has an eventive interpretation, or, as Dahl tries to capture the difference: "the perfect used in a resultative sense differs from a resultative construction (…) in that there is more focus on the event than on the state".[5]

In view of the definitions and constraints presented above, we conclude that VAN + *V-vA* and LETT + *V-vA* PPCs in Hungarian, with some restrictions, correspond

[1] Lars Johanson, "Viewpoint operators in European languages", in *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, ed. Östen Dahl (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), 27–187, 41.
[2] Dahl and Hedin, "Current relevance and event reference", 390–9.
[3] Comrie's discussion of the perfect also supports this line of thinking. Comrie notes that there is a natural relationship between the perfect and the perfective aspect, which is in concordance with the fact that there are some languages in which the perfect can only be formed of perfective input verbs, but there are none where it is restricted to the imperfective aspect. (Cf. Comrie, *Aspect*, 63–4.)
[4] Östen Dahl, *Tense and Aspect Systems* (Cambridge MA & Oxford: Blackwell, 1985), 134.
[5] Ibid., 134.

to the above described perfect-like construction types. The most important restriction to be dealt with is the argument structure shift which has led most linguists to analyse Hungarian PPC formation as passivization. As we have already discussed, Tóth and Bartos convincingly argue against the passive approach, hence in the rest of the subsection we focus on the semantic factors that control/govern the phenomena.

Mention must be made of Comrie's remarks on this topic. When discussing the interrelations between aspect and voice he points out that in many languages overt expression of perfect meaning is only allowed in the passive voice. This, of course, leads to specific argument structure constraints: "one of the disadvantages of this particular relationship between aspect and voice is that the perfect can be maintained as an overtly distinct category only with verbs that have a passive, i.e., for the majority of Indo-European languages, transitive verbs".[1] The semantic/pragmatic background of this pattern is that the effect of an action causing a change of state is "more apparent in the object than in the agent",[2] and that is why the input object is focused on instead of the input subject. A more detailed analysis of the relation between aspect and voice is given by Kurylowitz, who argues that these categories are genetically related, emphasizing that "the semantic feature common to these two categories was the intransitive value, the differentiating contrast being state (perfect) versus action (in the mediopassive)".[3]

This pattern holds for simple resultative constructions as well, which is confirmed by Dahl's remarks on the Swedish resultative: "the construction is 'ergative' in the sense that the subject is interpreted as the 'deep' subject of intransitives and as the 'deep' object of transitives".[4]

3.2.3.1. The Hungarian stative resultative (VAN + *V-vA*)

On the basis of Tóth's account and our discussion so far, it is sustainable that VAN + *V-vA* PPCs represent a resultative construction type. The main arguments supporting this are the following: the pragmatic constraint on current relevance holds for these constructions; they only allow for telic input predicates; the output is always stative, consequently it is incompatible with event-related adverbials or oblique representation of the agent.

3.2.3.2. The Hungarian eventive resultative (LETT + *V-vA*)

The described current relevance constraint and the telicity requirement of the input predicate hold for LETT + *-vA* PPCs as well, but, unlike the resultative construction type, these PPCs have an eventive reading and they allow for event-related adverbials and the oblique representation of the agent (cf. (27b)). Consequently the output aspect of the construction is not stative, but dynamic and telic (cf. (27a)).

(27) a. *A levél egy óra alatt lett megírva.*
the letter one hour during has (had) become PV_{perf}-write-vA
'The letter has been written in an hour.'
b. *A levél általam lett megírva.*

[1] Comrie, *Aspect*, 84–5.
[2] Ibid., 86.
[3] Jerzy Kurylowicz, *The Inflectional Categories of Indo–European* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1964), 61–2.
[4] Dahl, *Tense and Aspect Systems*, 134.

the letter by-1SG has/(had) become PV_{perf}-write-vA
'The letter has been written by me.'

Based on these features we consider this construction type a substitute for the aspectual category of the perfect, and we label it as the *eventive resultative*.

3.3. The aspectual functions of PPCs in the Csángó dialect

As it was formerly mentioned, the atypical distribution pattern of PPCs in the Csángó dialect can mostly be explained by the aspectual functions assigned to the construction type in this dialect. The crucial difference between standard Hungarian and Csángó VAN + *V-vA* PPCs lies in the functional ambiguity of the latter. Csángó VAN + *V-vA* PPCs seem to cover the functions of VAN + *V-vA* and LETT + *V-vA* PPCs of standard Hungarian, accordingly they can follow both distribution patterns. This assumption is supported by the fact that our database contains 1472 examples of VAN + *V-vA* PPCs and only one example of LETT + *V-vA* PPC, which has also led us to the conclusion that, in this dialect, VAN + *V-vA* PPCs fill in the functions that are assigned to LETT + *V-vA* PPCs in standard Hungarian.

3.3.1. The Csángó stative resultative VAN + *V-vA* PPC

A large part of the resultative VAN + *V-vA* PPCs in the Csángó dialect follow the standard Hungarian pattern described in section **3.2.3.1**. The pragmatic constraint on current relevance and the telicity requirement hold for these constructions, and the output is stative, therefore no event-related adverbials or *by*-phrases are allowed in these examples. As far as argument srtucture is concerned most input predicates are transitive (cf. (28)) or unaccusative (cf. (29)), which corresponds to the standard Hungarian argument structure constraints, but our data show that resultative PPCs in this dialect also allows for unergative input predicates.

(28) a. *Abba, a fel vót írva, hogy mikor jönnek*
that-in that PV_{up} was write-vA that when come-3PL
a bocsúsok, akkor ott lássák.
the pilgrims then there see-3PL
'It was written there, so that when pilgrims come, they can see it.'

b. *Gondolták, hogy ki tudja, mi van eltemetve benne.*
thought-3PL that who knows that is PV_{off}-bury-vA in-3SG
'They thought who knows what is buried in there.'

c. *De nagyböjtbe nem erőst jöttek, mert meg volt tiltva.*
but Lent-in not very came-3PL because PV_{perf} was forbid-vA
'But they didn't really come during Lent, as it had been forbidden.'

(29) a. *El van bolondulva a világ, esszevegyült a világ.*
PV_{off} is go.crazy-vA the world intermingled the world
'The world has gone crazy, it is mixed up.'

b. *Ment, ment, ment a pusztaságba, bé volt sötétülvel, nem látott.*
went went went the desert-in PV_{in} was darken-vA not saw-3SG
'He went on in the desert, it was dark, he couldn't see.'

c. *Miko' hazaértünk meg voltunk fagyval.*

when home-arrived-1PL PV_{perf} were-1PL freeze-vA
'When we got home, we were frozen.'

Besides these, there are many examples of resultative PPCs that do not occur or do not have counterparts in the standard use.

(30) a. (Nem kérik meg a lányokat?)
Há meg vannak kérve suk üdeje.
discourse.Part. PV_{perf} are-3PL ask-vA much time-Poss.3SG
'(The girls were not proposed to?) Well, they are sued for their hands for a long time already.'

b. *Há. Akkor el van vive!*
discourse.Part. then PV_{away} is take-vA
'Of course! And then it is taken away.'

c. (Az a pénz, amelyiket magad a kezedvel odaadod, azt nem panaszolja senki. Hogy mondjam, ne bánja meg senki ...)
Akkor az ugye meg van bánva.
then that Question.Particle PV_{perf} is regret-vA
'(The money that you give away with your own hands that is not complained about by anyone. How should I put it, noone regrets it...) (lit.) That is regretted then, isn't it.'

(31) a. *Éltünk négyen, met most csak ketten vagyunk maradva.*
lived-1PL four.of.us because now only two.of.us are-1PL remain-vA
'There were four of us, but now it is just the two of us who remained (alive).'

b. *A legnagyobb testvérem meg van halval.*
the biggest brother-Poss.1SG PV_{perf} is die-vA
'My eldest brother is dead.'

c. *(...) én kicsike votam, akkor még nem is még votam akkor megszületvel.*
I little was-1SG then yet not also yet was-1SG then PV_{perf}-born-vA
'I was little (at that time), I wasn't even born.'

The examples in (30) and (31) above are formed from transitive or unaccusative verbs that cannot serve as input for the standard Hungarian PPCs, i.e. they are ungrammatical or by all means marked in standard use. The frequency of this kind of examples indicates that they do not represent marginal/marked cases in this dialect, but can rather be considered the result of extended PPC formation criteria. As we discussed it in detail, the most important factors and features of resultative PPC formation are the current relevance constraint at the level of pragmatics and the incompatibility with event-related adverbials at the syntactic/semantic level.

Considering all these, our conclusion is that the pragmatic constraint on current relevance stands at the basis of the extension: the speakers of this dialect seem to apply a wider interpretation of current relevance. As Dahl and Hedin point it out, there is an obvious connection between "the loosening of the conditions on what current relevance

means and the extension of resultative constructions to a larger group of verbs".[1] This tendency could account for the fact that the Csángó resultative PPC is much more productive than the standard Hungarian resultative PPC.

The increased productivity is traceable among each predicate type, and, according to our data, there is a relatively large number (15% of our data) of resultative PPCs built on unergative verbs (see the examples in section **2.3.1.**). We consider these data especially important for our analysis, since they indicate a pattern that constitutes one of the crucial differences between standard Hungarian and Csángó PPC formation.

3.3.2. The Csángó eventive resultative LETT + *V-vA* PPC

Finally, mention must be made of those cases in which the Csángó PPC cannot be defined as a simple resultative construction. These are the cases when *van/volt/lesz + V-vA* PPCs follow the distribution pattern of standard Hungarian LETT + *V-vA* PPCs. The peculiarity of this subtype of PPCs is that it is formally identical to the resultative construction, nevertheless it has an eventive reading, which is indicated by the fact that it allows for modification by event-related adverbials and oblique representation of the agent (cf. (17), (23)).

As far as distribution pattern is concerned, this is an existing construction type in the standard use (section **3.2.3.2.**), still its significance lies in the fact that, according to our data, the use of the past tense form of the copula *van* in these constructions is almost exclusive in the Csángó dialect. Moreover, the present tense form of the verb *van* also occurs in the construction type, which is, presumably, due to the influence of the Romanian language (for details see section **3.4.1.** below). These are the factors that account for the two essentially different distribution patterns of Csángó PPCs.

3.4. Other properties

Beyond those discussed in the previous sections we have to mention some additional phenomena that cannot be deduced from the constraints and aspectual functions described. First we will present those properties that can be ascribed to the influence of the Romanian language (**3.4.1.**), and second we will analyse those constructions that have an atelic input verb (**3.4.2.**).

3.4.1. Phenomena related to the influence of the Romanian language

In Romanian passive diathesis is defined as a lexico-grammatical category, which affects transitive verbs and which is mainly constrained by the lexical semantics of the verb and the dinamicity of the event described by the verb. As for its form, it is made up of a BE-type copula and a verbal participle (cf. (32a)); this latter – just like predicative adjectives – shares case, number and gender information with the syntactic subject of the sentence without losing its verbal semantics (or arguments). This is the point at which it differs from those predicative, adjectival participles that are (occasionally) built on intransitive verbs, as these describe a state/static property (cf. (32b)). With respect to their surface form, the two constructions are identical.

(32) a.	*Copilul*	*a fost*	*linistit*	*de*	*mama*.
	child-the	AUX	calm.down$_{PART}$	by	mother-the

[1] Dahl and Hedin, "Current relevance and event reference", 392–3.

'The child was calmed down by his mother.'

b. *Copilul a fost linistit.*
child-the AUX calm$_{PART}$
'The child was calm.'

Following the pattern in (32a) there are many examples like those in (33) in our corpus:

(33) a. *Isztentől van teremtve mindenféle.*
God-from is create-vA everything
'Everything is created by God.'
b. *Tudják-e még mi van az égbe,*
know-3PL-Question.Particle else what is the sky-in
ami az emberkéztől van csinálva?
that the man-hand-from is make-vA
'Do you know what else is there in the sky that is made by human hands?'
c. *Minden falu össze van járva tőllik.*
every village PV is walk-vA from-3PL
'Every village is toured by them.'

The influence of the Romanian pattern is presumably even more general and indirect: the examples in (34) below (following a Romanian word order) actually match standard Hungarian examples like **Az ablak négykor van betörve* (the window four-at is break-vA, lit. 'The window is broken at 4.') in that meaning, when the time point given by the adverb refers to the event expressed by the input verb, not to the result state. While this is completely out in standard Hungarian, it can be documented from the Csángó dialect. As a matter of fact, this type of construction resembles standard Hungarian LETT + *V-vA* in that it can be associated with adverbs referring to events. However, as opposed to standard Hungarian LETT + *V-vA*, in the Csángó dialect not only transitive verbs can serve as input. The Romanian pattern related to the Csángó construction is exemplified in (35a) for (34b) (see also Romanian (35b)).

(34) a. *80-ban fel vagyok szentelve páternak.*
80-in PV$_{up}$ am ordain-vA father-DAT
'I was ordained (lit. I am ordained) as a father in 1980.'
b. *Vagyok születve 44-be, egyedikén a májusnak.*
am born-vA 44-in, first-Poss.3SG-on the May-DAT
'I was born (lit. I am born) in 1944, on May the 1st.'
c. *S meg vagyok gyónva, most első pénteken.*
and PV$_{perf}$ am confess-vA now first Friday-on
'And I've confessed (lit. I'm confessed) now, on the first Friday (of the month).'
d. *November 7-én vagyok beirva a születési könyvembe.*
November 7-on am PV$_{in}$-write-vA the natal book-Poss.1SG-in
'I've been registered (lit. I'm written) in my birth certificate on November the 7th.'

(35) a. *Sunt născut în 44.*

am born$_{PART}$ in 44
'I was born (lit. I am born) in 1944.'

b. *M-am* *născut* *în* *44.*
CL(REFL)$_{1SG}$habeo$_{past1SG}$ born$_{PART}$ in 44
'I was born in 1944.'

3.4.2. Constructions with an atelic input

Another direction of the 'overgeneration' of PPCs in Csángó can be detected among the (not too numerous) examples with an atelic input verb. This is exemplified in (36) (see also examples in section **2.3.3.**).

(36) a. *Azért a lélekért van imádkozva, ez az enyém!*
that-for the soul-for is pray-vA this the mine
'That soul is (being) prayed for, this soul is mine!'

b. *Megállítom megálltak, s felvettek, s*
PV$_{perf}$-stopped-1SG PV$_{perf}$-stopped-3PL and PV$_{up}$-picked-3PL and
megkérdték merrefelé vagyunk utazva, s én megneveztem.
PV$_{perf}$-asked-3PL whereabout are-1PL travel-vA and I PV$_{perf}$-named-1SG
'I've stopped them, they've stopped and picked me up, and asked where we were travelling to, and I named it.'

c. *met ez nem most van történve, van vagy 10, 15 esztendeje.*
because this not now is happen-vA is approx 10 15 year-Poss.3SG
'Because this is (=has) not happened nowadays, ten, fifteen years have passed since.'

d. (Ahol megmutitódott Szűz Mária, ott látod-e, kijött egy víz. S ott a víz mellett kijött egy nagy trandafir, fa, uljan, s tálbe, nyárba, ha havazik, ha nem havazik az virágzik örökké.)
Ha nem virágozva lennék, akkor ott
if not blossom-vA be-COND-3SG then there
nem mutitódótt volna meg Szűz Mária.
not showed be-COND PV$_{pref}$ Virgin Maria
'(There, where the Blessed Virgin revealed herself, a spring appeared. And there, beside the spring outgrew a rose, a bush, like that, and be it winter, be it summer, whether it snows or not, that rose-bush is always in flower.) If that weren't in flowers, then there the Blessed Virgin would not have revealed herself.'

While it can be asserted that examples of the type presented in (20) can occur (to a greater or lesser extent) in standard Hungarian as well,[1] those illustrated in (36a–d) having an unergative or unaccusative input verb are restricted to the Csángó dialect. The constructions with a transitive input verb, also available in standard Hungarian, have the function to express impersonality, and takes the function of impersonal constructions,[2]

[1] Bartos notes with regard to verbs with participle suffix featuring in these constructions that they must denote either a resulting state, or a process viewed as stativized (cf. Bartos, "The syntax of Hungarian *-vA* adverbial participles...", 23).

[2] For that matter it is characteristic of the Finno-Ugric languages that the fundamental voice opposition is more the personal/impersonal than the active/passive (cf. James P. Blevins,

therefore their use is motivated. With constructions having an unaccusative or unergative input verb, on the other hand, this factor cannot play a role, thus they seem to be the result of a simple overgeneration based on analogy.

3.5. The syntax of the Csángó PPC

The syntax of the Csángó PPC seems to be best handled with a slight modification of the syntactic structure proposed by Bartos (cf. (12)). We assume that the functional projection FP built on the *-vA* suffix has the extended projection of the verb as its complement. In case of transitive verbs this means an insertion above CAUS and below VoiceP, while in case of unaccusatives an insertion below CAUS. FP in its turn can be the complement of a *Ø* aspectual head, in which case it acquires a state aspect (otherwise it has a process reading). In this model CAUS is responsible solely for agentivity and not also for the process reading, as process reading is available for unaccusatives as well (depending on the lexical semantics of the verb). So if the input verb is telic, then the state aspect of the construction can only be provided by the AspP built on FP. If the input verb is a state verb, FP itself has a state aspect, thus its extension with an AspP is unjustified. If the input verb is atelic, the FP built on the extended projection of such verbs implicitly cannot be the complement of an AspP, as atelicity does not imply a change of state. The role of the *Ø* affix heading AspP is to transform the aspect of a change of state predicate (a complex predicate having a process segment and an end point) into a state aspect. While the complement of the copula *van* is always an AspP, the complement of *lett* (respectively of *van/volt/lesz* used with the semantics of *lett*) is an FP which, consequently, has a process reading in itself, except when the input is a state verb.[1]

As we have seen above, in the Csángó dialect the function of standard Hungarian *lett* is overtaken by forms of *van*. Therefore in this dialect *van* can take both an AspP and an FP complement. The resultative is grammatical only out of a telic input in Csángó PPCs (cf. (37)); in these cases *van* has an AspP complement. As atelic and state verbs cannot be extended to AspP, we do not expect to find such examples in the Csángó dialect either, which is supported by (the lack of such) data.

(37) a. *Volt egy szomszédja, el volt menve sok időtől.*
was a neighbour-Poss.3SG PV_{away} was go-vA many time-from
'He had a neighbour, he had been gone for a long time.'
b. *Extraterestuk [földönkívüliek], tudod, hogy mondják,*
UFO-s know-2SG how say-3PL

"Passives and impersonals", *Journal of Linguistics* 39 (2003): 473–520., and the literature cited therein).

[1] In all those (rare) cases when the input verb is having a state aspect (e.g. *ismer* 'kens') the construction is not syntactically ill-formed but semantically/pragmatically uninterpretable, as there is no such change of state that would lead to some (relevant) result state. As both the VAN + *V-vA* and the LETT + *V-vA* construction is resultative (cf. section **3.**), the existence of such a state resulting from a change of state is a condition of well-formedness. The standard Hungarian and the Csángó LETT + *V-vA* differ in that eventive predicates with only a process segment (and with no end point) are more productive in the Csángó dialect (cf. (39)). As in the case of states there is not even a process phase, we expect that these cannot be inputs to PPC formation in the Csángó dialect either; this expectation is borne out by the (lack of) data.

hogy más fődről vannak jövel.
that other place-form are-3PL come-vA
'UFOs, you know, how they say, they are (came) from other planets.'

c. (Az a pénz, amelyiket magad a kezedvel odaadod, azt nem panaszolja senki. Hogy mondjam, ne bánja meg senki ...)
Akkor az ugye meg van bánva.
then that Question.Particle PV_{perf} is regret-vA
'(The money that you give away with your own hands that is not complained about by anyone. How should I put it, no one regrets it...) (lit.) That is regretted then, isn't it.'

d. *Akár hogy es tőlem nincsen soha elfelejtve.*
any how also from-1SG is.not never PV_{off}-forget-vA
'Anyway, I never forget that (lit. It is never forgotten by me).'

e. *Minden falu össze van járva tőllik.*
every village PV is walk-vA from-3PL
'Every village is toured by them.'

As we have seen (cf. **3.3.2.**), the Csángó eventive resultative (that always requires a telic input verb) can appear both with the present and the past tense form of the copula. In these cases the copula takes an FP complement (cf. (38)). Similarly, it is an FP that is the complement of a copula being the building block of a PPC with an atelic input verb (cf. (39)).

As in our model eventivity is not linked to CAUS, but it is available below CAUS as well (being dependent solely on the lexical semantics of the verb), it is to be expected that we'll find eventive resultative and LETT+ *V-vA* with an atelic input among unaccusative verbs, too (cf. (38a–b) vs. (38c), respectively (39a–b) vs. (39c–d)).

(38) a. *Vagyok születve 44-be, egyedikén a májusnak.*
am born-vA 44-in, first-Poss.3SG-on the May-DAT
'I was born (lit. I am born) in 1944, on May the 1st.'

b. *Idefelé van meghalva, de mind kínlódva van*
hereabout is PV_{perf}-die-vA but always agonize-vA is
meghalva, s azétt es kerütték.
PV_{perf}-die-vA and therefore too shunned-3PL
'He has died over here, but he has died in pain, and that's why they shunned him.'

c. *Koporsó meg volt csinálva egy embertől magának,*
coffin PV_{perf} was make-vA a man-from himself-DAT
s vették Jézust, s belétették.
and took-3PL Jesus-ACC and PV_{into}-put-3PL
'The coffin was made by a man for himself, and they took (the body of) Jesus, and they put him in it.'

(39) a. *Megállítom megálltak, s felvettek, s*
PV_{perf}-stopped-1SG PV_{perf}-stopped-3PL and PV_{up}-picked-3PL and
megkérdték merrefelé vagyunk utazva, s én megneveztem.
PV_{perf}-asked-3PL whereabout are-1PL travel-vA and I PV_{perf}-named-1SG

'I've stopped them, they've stopped and picked me up, and asked where we were travelling to, and I named it.'

b. *met ez nem most van történve, van vagy 10, 15 esztendeje.*
because this not now is happen-vA is approx 10 15 year-Poss.3SG
'Because this is (=has) not happened nowadays, ten, fifteen years have passed since.'

c. *Az es vót hajtva tőle, az én emberemtől,*
that also was chase-vA from-3SG the my man-Poss.1SG-from
örökké jött a dologról, italos vót.
always came the work-from ebrious was
'He/She was also chased by him, by my husband, he always came from work, he was drunk.'

d. *Én egy üdőbe, mikor volt a kommunisták, nagyan vótam üldözve,*
I a time-in when was the communists very.much was-1SG persecute-vA
mert jöttek Magyarországról, mert filmet csináltak.
because came-3PL Hungary-from because movie-ACC made-3PL
'Sometime ago when there were the communists (in power), I was persecuted a lot, because (people) came from Hungary (to me), because they were shooting a film.'

4. Conclusions

As we have seen, standard Hungarian perfect-like PPCs are available in Csángó as well, moreover, in this latter dialect the formation of PPCs is less constrained as (i) it covers verbs classified as unergative in the literature; (ii) it is almost fully productive in the domain of transitive and unaccusative verbs; (iii) it readily allows atelic input verbs and (correspondingly) a process output. This can be explained if we assume that in both standard Hungarian and Csángó the syntax overgenerates, and the results are then sorted out by pragmatic filters; the two dialects differ in that pragmatic filters (that is the relevance rules applying to the reference time of the event expressed by the input verbs) work differently.

Therefore, even if PPCs exhibit some similarities and even overlap with the passive regarding their communicative effects, they cannot be treated as passives in the argument structure transforming sense.

Those theories that try to derive the wellformedness criteria of PPCs from the argument structure of the input verb, have to account for a multitude of pragmatic constraints. A semantic/aspectual approach on the other hand starts from the aspectual features of the input verb (that in its turn can also determine the argument structure of the verb) and the conditions for grammatical PPC formation is taken to be the effect of the lexico-semantics of the input verb together with the semantic properties of the construction as a whole.

The high productivity of Csángó PPCs can therefore be deduced from the joint work of factors such as (i) aspectual functions of the resulting structure, (ii) the setup of the pragmatic filter, (iii) analogy, and (iv) the Romanian influence. As it is clear by now, none of the theories that base their analyses solely on the argument structure of the input verb can be directly used to account for the Csángó data. In **3.5.** we made an attempt to adjust the results of previous literature so that it can account for the Csángó data as well.