

THE HUNGARIAN IMPERATIVE PARTICLE *HADD*
A CONTRASTIVE LOOK AT THE DEVELOPMENT
OF ANALOGOUS MARKERS OF SENTENCE MOOD
IN SOME EUROPEAN LANGUAGES*

ATTILA PÉTERI

Department of German Linguistics
Eötvös Loránd University
Rákóczi 5.
H-1088 Budapest
Hungary
peteria@t-online.hu

Abstract: This study is devoted to the Hungarian sentence mood particle *hadd*, which developed into a particle from the imperativ form of the verb *hagy* ‘let’. It primarily functions in non-addressee-oriented directives, i.e., it marks speech acts meant by the speaker to instigate actions of the speaker him- or herself or of third parties rather than actions of the interlocutor. The interlocutor is meant to play a—mediating, supporting, or tolerating—“secondary” role in this. Based on corpus research, the syntax and pragmatics of the particle *hadd* will be illustrated. The syntactic position of *hadd* differs from that of modal particles in being considerably more fixed. Concerning its pragmatic function, uses leading away from the function of a particle indicating sentence mood can be discerned. Similar developments can be illustrated for other European languages. In some languages (e.g., the Slavic languages), the word meaning ‘let’ develops into a particle, in other languages it turns into an auxiliary verb.

Keywords: particles, sentence mood, syntax, pragmatics, directive speech acts, contrastive linguistics

1. Preliminary remarks

While interrogative particles have been studied rather intensively across natural languages (cf. WALS, Chapter 116), linguists have paid far less

* Work on this paper, as well as the workshop presentation it is based on, was supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (Project OTKA NN79763). I thank Ferenc Kiefer for helpful comments. The paper was translated into English from the German original by Hans-Martin Gärtner.

attention to particles marking the sentence mood of imperatives. In an overwhelming majority of European languages—much as in the majority of the world's natural languages¹—morphologically marked verbal mood is employed for the formation of imperative sentences. Therefore, imperatives were considered less of a challenge than interrogatives were. Of particular interest, however, are the hitherto less well studied non-2nd-person imperative sentences occurring in many languages, as well as equivalent periphrastic constructions expressing non-addressee-oriented requests.

Although Hungarian possesses morphologically marked imperatival forms for both numbers and all three persons, non-2nd-person imperatives are frequently marked by the sentence mood particle *hadd*. What is more, for 1sg imperatives, *hadd* is obligatory (cf. Kenesei et al. 1998, 311). Etymologically, this particle goes back to the imperatival form of the verb *hagy* 'let'. Periphrastic imperatives based on particles or constructions deriving from verbs meaning 'let' can be found in several other languages. German is one of these (*Lass/Lasst uns gehen!* 'Let's go!'), although the imperative marker *lass(t)* 'let.imp.2sg/pl' can be analysed as an auxiliary verb. Russian, on the other hand, is a language possessing an imperative particle (*pust'*, *puskaj* 'let.imp.2sg').

The present study aims at comparing and contrasting Hungarian *hadd* and similar structures in a selection of European languages. In particular, the Russian imperative particle and the German *lass(t)* + infinitive construction will be considered. Of special interest will be similarities among these constructions concerning the development of their meanings. The imperatival form of the verb meaning 'let' constitutes the starting point for further development in all three languages. Each time, additional uses of these grammatical items can be found in which their meaning is even further removed from 'let'. In this case, they function as modal categories (subordinating conjunctions, modal particles, or modal verbs). Increasing abstractness of meaning is accompanied by increasingly restricted distribution.² On the formal grammatical level, however,

¹ Cf. WALS, Chapter 70: The morphological imperative. Of the 547 natural languages studied, only 122 lack morphologically marked 2nd person imperatives.

² One might ask whether the developments outlined here can be viewed as grammaticalization. If one follows Heine et al. (1991, 41–2), who take the essence of grammaticalization to lie in “meaning abstraction”, which may—but need not (cf. Stolz 1994, 24)—be accompanied by various phonological, morphological, and syntactic processes, one must take these developments to be similar to grammat-

substantial differences exist, most probably rooted in the typological differences of the three linguistic systems: integration into the respective system proceeds in three different ways.

Comparative studies should start off with describing the functional domain—the *tertium comparationis* (cf. Zifonun 2001). The functional domain in focus here is constituted by non-2nd-person directives, which, in the languages under investigation, are primarily based on particles or auxiliaries. We will begin with a descriptive section studying the distribution of these grammatical categories within the individual languages from the perspective of semantic function as well as grammatical form. In our concluding section, we will return to function proper and address cross-linguistically valid relations between the domain under investigation here and its neighbouring domains.

2. The puzzle of non-addressee-oriented directives

Within general linguistics the fundamental question arises whether it is an inherent property of directive illocutions that a request can only be directed to the interlocutor(s). This, of course, is the default case. However, one must ask whether it is possible in principle that a speaker demands an action of a third person not directly addressed by the speech act or even of him- or herself.

From this perspective it is particularly interesting that numerous natural languages, several European languages among them, provide various kinds of grammaticalized expressive means for non-2nd-person

icalization. Wegener (1998) also takes grammaticalization to primarily consist in loss of semantic content and concomitant gain of pragmatic strength. This change is indeed what one observes with respect to the meaning of the words at issue here. On the other hand, the original notion of grammaticalization due to Meillet (1912) implies the development of grammatical morphemes out of free lexical structures. Thus, from the formal syntactic perspective our case looks more like the opposite: the imperatival verb form changes into an auxiliary within which the imperative suffix, the essential grammatical morpheme, is so to speak “dissolved”. From this perspective, the process at hand could rather be considered a case of “lexicalization”. However, this paper is not centrally concerned with fitting the phenomena at issue into a theory of language change. We are more interested in observing cross-linguistically valid chains of association and their interaction with structural properties of the linguistic system. In fact, the reciprocal relation between lexicon and grammar must be construed as dynamic.

directives. According to WALS,³ 174 (46%) out of 375 languages studied possess a so-called morphological imperative-hortative system. This means that requests not immediately directed to the interlocutor can be expressed through verbal mood. The overwhelming majority of these systems (133 languages) are formally homogeneous, i.e., 2nd-person and non-2nd-person verb forms constitute a uniform paradigm. Such a formally homogeneous imperative-hortative system can also be found in Hungarian, where the imperative-hortative morpheme *-j-* can be combined with verb forms irrespective of their person marking.⁴ The statistics only cover languages expressing non-2nd-person directives via verbal mood, not languages doing it by means of particles marking imperative-hortative sentence mood and/or other grammatical devices. With the addition of the latter kinds of languages the number of imperative-hortative systems appears to reach beyond 50%.⁵

To repeat, it is of fundamental theoretical interest whether it is possible at all not to direct a request at the interlocutor. Birjulin and Hrakovskij (2001) answer this question in the affirmative:⁶

“Is there a general solution to the question as to which of the participants of an act of communication can be the agent [= performer of the prescribed action]? In our view, the answer is very simple: any of the established participants of an act of communication or any theoretically admissible combination of such participants can appear in the function of the agent [performer of the prescribed action].” (*op.cit.*, 6)

³ <http://wals.info>. Chapter 72: Imperative-hortative systems.

⁴ It is true that the classification of the verb forms suffixed with *-j-* is not uncontroversial in the Hungarian grammatical tradition. The same forms also occur in certain types of subordinate clauses, e.g., purpose clauses, as well as in optative clauses. Tompa (1968) assumes what he calls a “subjunctive-imperative”, while Pomozi (1991), relying on additional syntactic criteria for telling apart imperative and subjunctive, postulates paradigm homonymy.

⁵ Here we disregard the fact that in the grammars of many languages, certain terms of address (forms to do with politeness and distancing), such as German “V-forms” (*Siezen*), are not based on 2nd-person verb forms but on additional imperatival forms or periphrases developed for that purpose. Dealing with this issue is beyond the scope of the present work. The directives in question are functionally 2nd-person directives: they are immediately directed at the interlocutor.

⁶ Birjulin and Hrakovskij (2001, 6ff) postulate a universal classification of imperative sentences based on the criterion of who—according to the speaker’s intention—should be the potential “performer of the prescribed action”. Apart from the interlocutor(s), that role can be filled by the speaker as well as one or more absent persons (“outside persons”).

In order to make this more tangible, we consider the following example offered by Weinrich (1993, 265) to illustrate the archaic use of the German “Konjunktiv” as well as its contemporary periphrasis.

- (1) Der Bote trete ein und überbringe seine Botschaft.
 → Sagen Sie dem Mann, er soll reinkommen und seine Sache vortragen.
 ‘May the messenger enter and deliver his message.’
 → ‘Tell the man he shall enter and state his case.’

What is remarkable here is the fact that a request expressed by an archaic subjunctive is transformed into a functionally 2-nd-person directive sentence under the assumption that the two sentences are equivalent. This shows the peculiar nature of non-addressee-oriented directives. The request is directed at a third, and in fact absent, person in the sense that it is that person who is obliged to carry out the action at issue. Necessarily, however, the interlocutor is part of this: in the case at hand he or she participates as mediator. Although it is possible in principle that, by means of a directive sentence, a speaker expresses that the action proposed should not be carried out by the interlocutor, that interlocutor nevertheless has a part in the action in some way, for example, as a mediating, instigating, supporting, or tolerating participant.

Things are different in the example in (2) (from The Bible, German “Einheitsübersetzung”, Genesis 1,3).

- (2) Gott sprach: Es werde Licht. Und es wurde Licht.
 ‘God said, Let there be light: and there was light.’

In this well-known biblical passage there is no interlocutor. God is alone when creating the world. Yet he expresses a request by stating his will regarding the change of state of the world. And by God’s creative power the intended change will occur in the world.

Searle (1985, 13–4) defines the directive speech act type in terms of three criteria: The illocutionary point (“The illocutionary point of these verbs consists in the fact that they are attempts [...] by the speaker to get the hearer to do something”), the direction of fit between words and the world (“world-to-words-direction”), and the sincerity condition W(ant) (“the sincerity condition is want (or wish or desire)”):

- (3) ! ↑ W (H does A) (op.cit., 14)

If no participating interlocutor can be identified, the illocutionary force is backgrounded and the volitional attitude and world-to-word direction of fit get into the foreground. Such directives are rooted in the deep seated belief of man that, by expressing a will regarding a change of the world to occur, this change actually can be made to occur.

Thus, one way of interpreting non-addressee-oriented directives is that they require the interlocutor to participate in the intended action in some way other than carrying it out. Alternatively, they imply that the illocutionary point is backgrounded while propositional attitude and direction of fit become salient.

Of particular interest are functionally 1st-person directives, according to which the intended action is ultimately to be carried out by the speaker him- or herself. In this connection I would like to abstract away from the possible but fairly unusual case of the speaker communicating with him- or herself and taking in the role of interlocutor, as in the examples in (4). Instead, only cases like (5) shall be considered.

- (4) (a) Nur nicht vergessen! (German)
 (b) Jaj, csak el ne felejtsem! (Hungarian)
 ‘(Oh), I mustn’t forget this!’
- (5) Lassen Sie mich ausreden! (German)
 ‘Let me finish (making my point)!’

The action proper, i.e., keeping on talking, is carried out by the speaker. Therefore, functionally this is a 1st-person directive involving the interlocutor as a “tolerating” person.

3. The Hungarian imperative particle *hadd*

Although Hungarian possesses a full-fledged imperatival paradigm, in which the imperative suffix *-j-* can be combined with all person suffixes, non-2nd-person forms are often supplemented with the imperative particle *hadd*. Etymologically, *hadd*—pronounced [hɒd], with a short [d]—goes back to the imperative form of the verb *hagy* (‘let’; 2sg, definite conjugation). The original form got shortened, *hagyd* → *hadd*, or, more precisely, as shown by the Hungarian historical corpus, both forms coexisted during the eighteenth century as variants of pronunciation, of which the shorter

one developed into the particle. A few marked exceptions aside, contemporary Hungarian *hadd* combines with non-2nd-person imperative verbs and is located syntactically left-adjacent to the finite verb most of the time. To this day, there exists an equivalent colloquial “secondary” form *hagy* [hɒj], going back to the indefinite conjugation of the same verb:

- (6) *hadd* [hɒd] ← *hagyd* [hɒjd] ‘let’ (2sg.imp definite conjugation)
 (colloquial secondary form: *hagy* [hɒj] ← *hagyj* [hɒj:] ‘let’ 2sg.imp indefinite conjugation)
- (7) (a) *Hadd* / *hagy menjek!* (1sg) *Hadd* / *hagy menjünk!* (1pl)
 ‘Let me go!’ ‘Let us go!’
- (b) *Hadd* / *hagy menjen!* (3sg) *Hadd* / *hagy menjenek!* (3pl)
 ‘Let him/her go!’ ‘Let them go!’
- (c) **Hadd* / *hagy menj!* (2sg) **Hadd* / *hagy menjetek!* (2pl)

3.1. Categorical status and functions of the particle *hadd*

The categorial status of this particle is judged differently by different authors.⁷ According to Szücs (2010) it is impossible to determine any definite membership in one of the standard categories, given the particle’s formal syntactic and functional peculiarities. She considers it to be certain, however, that *hadd* is no independent lexical element, since no independent utterance can be based on it. Szücs assigns *hadd* the meaning ‘to ask for permission’ or ‘to grant permission’ as well as—limited to particular contexts—the meaning ‘to wish’. According to her, *hadd* is considered an independent category, *hadd* being a “bound function word with modal content” (Szücs 2010, 201; our translation).

Contrary to Szücs (*op.cit.*, 205ff), I think that the meaning ‘to ask for permission’ or ‘to grant permission’, which can be directly derived from the meaning of the original imperatival verb form of *hagy* ‘let’, is no longer attestable for the majority of cases. This meaning may well be present in some contexts, given that processes of language change are continuous and that the new meaning of a developing word gets separated from the original meaning of the source expression only gradually. According to my linguistic intuitions, however, *hadd* already functions as an independent grammatical item. Evidence for this stems from the following familiar literary passage, also cited by Szücs:

⁷ For an overview, see Szücs (2010).

- (8) Hadd látom, úgymond, mennyit ér
 see.1sg.ind.def so.say.3sg.ind how.much.acc worth.be.3sg.ind
 | A welszi tartomány.
 the Welsh province.nom
 ‘Let me see, he says, what the province of Wales is worth.’

In the poem by János Arany the sentence in (8) is uttered by England’s King Edward, who in doing so presumably neither asks for any permission nor grants himself any permission. He simply expresses that he wants to see the worth of the province and that he will see it. This coincides with the semantics of non-addressee-oriented directives described above.

In its primary function, *hadd* is the particle marking the sentence mood of non-2nd-person imperative sentences. An additional argument in favour of this is provided by the combinability of the particle with the various person forms of the verb. As already mentioned, it goes with 2nd person forms only very exceptionally. On the other hand, with 1sg forms *hadd* seems to be obligatory, while it is optional with other persons:

- (9) (Hadd) Menjen!
 go.imp.3sg
 ‘Let him go!’
- (10)??(Hadd) Menjek!
 go.imp.1sg
 ‘Let me go!’

First person singular imperative forms without the particle *hadd* would seem to appear unusual because they give the impression that the speaker is talking to him- or herself, something that is not the standard way of human communication. Once such sentences are supplemented with the particle *hadd*, they express participation of the interlocutor, such that the interlocutor support, tolerate, or permit etc. the action of the speaker envisaged. This way a request directed toward the speaker can be “legitimized”.

This hypothesis is also confirmed by the frequency distribution of person forms with *hadd* in Hungarian language corpora. In three of them, which predominantly contain oral or “conceptually oral” texts, as well as in two written corpora—included as controls—I found the distributions shown in (11).⁸ Data from the Hungarian Historical Corpus shows that

⁸ The data come from the sociolinguistic interviews of the Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, four twentieth-century dra-
Acta Linguistica Hungarica 59, 2012

hadd was used during the 18th and 19th centuries with both 1st and 3rd person with approximately the same frequency. Since then, however, the particle has continued to specialize for 1st person forms and occurs with other persons only sporadically.⁹

- (11) *Hadd* and the distribution of verbal person forms

	BUSZI	Plays	Parliament	Hung. Nat. ¹⁰	Hung. Hist.
1sg	27	11	973	55	38
3sg	2	4	11	22	48
1pl	0	0	9	9	8
3pl	1	0	7	13	6

I found one single instance (among the 1250 items checked!) involving a 2sg verb:

- (12) *hadd* legyen még mélyebb körülötted a hallgatás,
 be.imp.3sg yet deeper around.you the silence,
hadd siettesd Te magad is az amúgy is múltót.
 rush.imp.2sg you yourself also the otherwise also ephemeral.acc
 ‘The silence around you should become even deeper. You could/should yourself
 rush what will wane anyway.’

According to my native speaker intuition, any constructed 2nd-person imperative sentences containing *hadd* are clearly ungrammatical. With respect to (12), this is not my intuition. Perhaps this is due to the purpose reading of this sentence: The interlocutor acts in some way in order to affect his or her surroundings such that silence is becoming even greater and what is to wane anyway will pass even faster. In what follows I will

matic plays, protocols of the plenary meetings of the Hungarian parliament during the year 2001, as well as the Hungarian National Corpus and the Hungarian Historical Corpus, which can be found via the homepage of the Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

⁹ The extremely high frequency in parliamentary protocols is presumably due to properties specific to the situation, many instances being routine expressions of the speakers signalling boundaries of discourse segments: *Hadd mondjam* ‘Let me say’, *Hadd emlékeztessen Önöket* ‘Let me remind you’, etc. In Hungarian, such segmentation devices are typically realized by *hadd* followed by a first person *verbum dicendi*.

¹⁰ There was one instance involving a 2nd-person verb in the Hungarian National Corpus (see right below).

show that *hadd* sometimes works like a conjunction heading a purpose clause. The above example appears to come close to that function.

Although the particle *hadd* usually combines with imperative verb forms, there are a few examples involving indicative and even conditional forms. These do not constitute recent developments, given that they also occur in the Hungarian National Corpus in 18th century texts already. On the basis of the materials at my disposal I could not discern any change in frequency among these forms. Whatever the time period or corpus, they are rare but not excluded:

- (13) ... most hadd zárom áldással beszédemet ...¹¹
 now close.1sg.ind benediction.with speech.my.acc
 ‘let me now finish my speech with benediction’

- (14) ... hadd váglok tehát pofon ...¹²
 hit.1sg→2sg.ind therefore face.on
 ‘let me hit you on the face’

These structures containing an indicative verb seldom occur, yet according to my linguistic competence they are absolutely correct, indeed they represent a slightly more refined register. From a theoretical point of view, these examples are interesting because the verbal mood is neutralized in them, which points to a rather high degree of grammaticalization of the particle. In such cases, the particle *hadd* is the only feature marking the imperative in the sentence. To a certain degree this effect is comparable to the neutralization of verbal mood in German adhortative and (polite) *Sie*-imperatives. As shown by Matzel and Ulvestad (1978; 1985), inverted verb–subject order is developing into the primary marker of the impera-

¹¹ Full citation: *Nemrég imádsággal nyitottam meg az Amerikai Egyesült Államok kongresszusának egyik ülészakát. Az elmondottak szellemében megköszönve figyelmüket és gyümölcsöző munkát kívánva a Tisztelt Háznak, most hadd zárom áldással beszédemet, elmondva az ároni áldást.* ‘Recently I opened a session of the United States Congress with a prayer. In line with what I just said I thank you for your attention and wish the honorary assembly fruitful further proceedings. Now I would like to finish my speech with Aaron’s benediction’ (Parliamentary Protocols; László Tőkés, Bishop of the Reformed Church of Transylvania; 30.5.1990).

¹² Full citation: *Ha nem csak nézhetnéd, hanem érezhetnéd is a tenyeremet, hadd váglok tehát pofon, hogy illendő ítéletet tehessek felőle.* ‘For you to be able not just to see but also to feel my palm, let me slap your face, so that I can make a proper judgement of it.’ (Hungarian Historical Corpus; György Fejér, 1790).

tive clause in these structures, given the large-scale syncretism between original subjunctive forms and indicative forms in contemporary German. Altmann (1993) points out the fact that in recent times indicative forms get used in these sentence types more and more, even in cases where a distinguishable subjunctive form would be available (cf. Matzel–Ulvestad 1978; Altmann 1993, 1024):

- (15) (a) Sind wir doch vernünftig! *instead of* Seien wir doch vernünftig!
 be.1pl.ind we part. reasonable be.1pl.subj we part. reasonable
 ‘Let’s be reasonable!’
- (b) Sind Sie so gut, ... *instead of* Seien Sie so gut, ...
 be.3pl.ind you so kind be.3pl.subj you so kind
 ‘Could you be so kind ...’

In addition, the particle *hadd* may—even if very rarely—be combined with verbs in the conditional form. Since the 19th century such instances appear sporadically. No particular direction of development is discernible, though:

- (16) Hadd látnék egy szép csillagot¹³
 see.cond.1sg a beautiful star.acc
 ‘I would like to see a beautiful star.’
- (17) hadd lenne, hadd lenne mai sóvárgásom földerengő emlék¹⁴
 be.cond.3sg be.cond.3sg today’s longing.my looming memory
 ‘Let today’s longing of mine become a looming memory.’

These examples have one thing in common: *hadd* in fact functions in them as an optative particle. These sentences are no longer imperative sentences but optative sentences. Mostly they express irrealis wishes of the speaker but they are not about having the expression of that wish be followed by a change in the world. In the examples in (16) and (17), *hadd* can be replaced by the optative particle *bár* without any change in meaning. As we have already seen, non-addressee-oriented directives come close to expressions of wishes. This further development of the particle

¹³ Full citation: *Ha már nem lehetek veled: Hadd látnék egy szép csillagot, amely pótolna téged némileg* ‘If I cannot be with you anymore, I would like to see a beautiful star that could replace you a little’ (Hungarian Historical Corpus; Sándor Petőfi, 1848).

¹⁴ Hungarian National Corpus; László Nagy, 1995.

hadd shows a greater distance from the original concrete meaning of the verbal form in that the particle is losing an essential component, namely, its illocutionary force indicating potential.

In contemporary literary works of art one can even find examples in which *hadd* introduces a subordinate purpose clause, i.e., *hadd* is used as a subordinating conjunction:

- (18) ... s hagyta, hadd szaggassa, rázza a könyörtelen zokogás¹⁵
 and let.past.3sg tear.imp.3sg shake.imp.3sg the relentless crying
 ‘... and he/she let the relentless crying tear and shake him/her.’

- (19) kinyitottam az ablakot,
 open.past.1sg the window.acc
 hadd távozzék a Horváth közeliből a füst.¹⁶
 leave.imp.3sg the Horváth vicinity.his.from the smoke
 ‘I opened the window, so that the smoke could disappear from Horváth’s vicinity.’

In these examples, *hadd* can be replaced by the conjunction *hogy*. As is well known, prototypical Hungarian purpose clauses are formed by the conjunction *hogy* ‘(so) that’ and the imperative form of the verb. In contrast to the neutral conjunction *hogy*, the item *hadd*, if used for that function, possesses a modal meaning indicating that the speaker considers the achievement of the goal described necessary.

The meaning change affecting *hadd* concerns increasing abstractness, starting from the finite verb form with the lexical meaning ‘let’/‘allow’, via the sentence mood particle as well as the optative particle to the subordinating conjunction of purpose clauses. Underlying this change, it seems, is a chain of association where the non-2nd-person directive “co-associates” a strong desire on part of the speaker or where this desire is linked up with further content such as ‘purpose’, ‘necessity’, etc. Similar meaning change is also attested in other languages, so we may be confronted with a cross-linguistically valid chain of association here.

3.2. The syntax of the imperative particle *hadd*

Typically, the imperative particle *hadd* occurs left-adjacent to the finite verb. In addition, the structure particle + finite verb occupies sentence

¹⁵ Hungarian National Corpus; Zoltán Jékely, 1982.

¹⁶ Hungarian National Corpus; Áron Tamási, 1985.

initial position in most examples. I will therefore split the question as to how to view the syntax of the imperative particle *hadd* in two: the first one concerns placement of *hadd* with respect to the finite verb, the second one concerns placement of the particle + verb complex within the sentence as a whole.

In what follows I will argue that the placement rules in question point to the clitic nature of the imperative particle *hadd*, a fact that chimes well with its classification as sentence mood particle.

Standard grammars of Hungarian do not devote specific sections to clitics. Generally, it is tacitly assumed that Hungarian, being an agglutinating language, does not have clitics. This assumption seems to be correct for pronouns, which actually do not normally get cliticized in unstressed positions but deleted, given that various agglutinative suffixes can take over their function. The case of particles, however, and in particular the case of sentence mood particles, is different.¹⁷ More recent research has shown that modal particles, too, may occasionally tend to cliticize (cf. German *Was is'n los?* 'What's up?'). This holds even more for sentence mood particles. Enclitic status of the Hungarian interrogative particle *-e* is generally acknowledged. Finnish marks interrogative sentences by means of the clitic particle *-ko/-kö*, which occurs after the verb's person agreement suffix but is in a "bound" relation to the verb evidenced by vowel harmony. Turkish even has an interrogative suffix which, in combination with certain verb forms, intervenes between verb stem and person agreement suffix. With other verb forms and after nouns it behaves like a particle occurring right-adjacent to the questioned word and undergoing vowel harmony (cf. Beczner et al. 2009, 21ff). Thus, agglutinating European languages show particularly well that sentence mood particles are proper candidates for cliticization. While the Hungarian particle *hadd* does not display vowel harmony with the verb stem,¹⁸

¹⁷ See also conjugation suffixes like *olvasok* 'I read', *szerelek* 'I love you' or nominal possessive suffixes like *könyvem* 'my book'. In the EUROTYP project, cliticization was predominantly studied with respect to pronominal clitics. In an inventory of clitics in the European languages it is stated about Hungarian that although the language does not possess pronominal clitics, it does contain clitic particles like the particles of negation *nem*, *ne* and *se*, the particle *is* 'also', and the interrogative particle *-e*. What is more, certain auxiliaries like, for example, the future auxiliary *fog* have a tendency toward cliticization. Although the particle *hadd* is not mentioned in the catalogue, it nicely fits into this series of items (cf. Vos-Veselovská 1999, 894, 926).

¹⁸ This would presumably be incompatible with its proclitic status. On realizing the particle one may not yet know what kind of verb follows. Verbal particles

its obligatory accent, however, shows its clitic status. Note the difference between (20a,b) and (20c):

- (20) (a) HADD mondja ... (b) NE mondja ... (c) csak MONDja ...¹⁹
 say.imp.3sg neg say.imp.3sg say.imp.3sg

(20) shows that the imperative particle *hadd* and the particle of negation *ne* attract sentence accent. The modal particle *csak*, however, remains unaccented, sentence accent being assigned to the verb instead. Accent on these particles cannot be interpreted as focusing accent, given that the particles are neither phrasal nor do they possess any referential function. What we find instead is that the particle forms a phonetic word with the verb such that through accenting the particle the verb gets accented, too. Through this kind of accentuation the sentence mood meaning takes centre stage together with the action to be carried out, which is expressed by the verb. The particle of negation *ne* possesses a function similar to that of *hadd*. It can be taken to be a prohibitive marker. In addition to negation it contributes to realizing the sentence mood meaning.²⁰

The item able to intervene between the particle *hadd* and the finite verb most easily is the negative particle *ne*. In the example in (21), the two particles amalgamate with the finite verb into a phonetic word. The entire complex structure *hadd ne kelljen* bears a single stress, which at the same time counts as sentence stress. The verb in this negative imperative form counts as focus of the sentence, i.e., what is made salient is the sentence mood meaning together with the negated verb meaning again.

- (21) Hadd ne kelljen iskolába menni!
 neg must.imp.3sg school.into go.inf
 ‘Allow me not to have to go to school!’

Other examples that show a constituent intervening between *hadd* and the finite verb are predominantly negated non-2nd-person imperatives. One of the strictest word order rules in Hungarian requires operators to precede their scopal domain. Since the particle *ne* also functions as negative operator it can attract other constituents into its scope. These

preceding the verb (preverbs) do not show vowel harmony, either, cf. *elmond* ‘tell’, *megússza* ‘get away with it’, etc.

¹⁹ *Csak* here functions as modal particle (approx. ‘(Let him) go ahead and say it’).

²⁰ Even if combinable with *hadd*, the form *ne* is restricted to imperative sentences. In declaratives the form of negation is *nem*.

should be placed right-adjacent to the particle and thus intervene between *hadd* and the finite verb:

- (22) **Hadd ne fejből,** hanem az előterjesztésből **idézzem,** hogy ...²¹
 neg head.from but the report.from cite.imp.1sg that
 ‘Let me not cite by heart, but cite from the report that ...’

Most clearly acceptable are such examples if they contain incorporated constituents, that is, if the constituent following *hadd ne* forms a fixed phrase with the verb: *fejből idéz* ‘cite by heart’, *gyalog megy* ‘go on foot’, etc. Non-incorporated objects and adverbials in this position are at least unusual, that is, only marginally acceptable. Clearly unacceptable are objects and adverbials between *hadd* and the finite verbs in non-negated forms:

- (23) Hadd ne gyalog menjek!
 neg on.foot go.imp.1sg
 ‘Let me not go on foot!’
- (24)^{??}Hadd ne csak a rosszat lássam benne!
 neg only the bad.acc see.imp.1sg him.in
 ‘Let me not just see the bad things in him!’
- (25)^{??}Hadd ne így nézzem a dolgokat!
 neg so see.imp.1sg the things.acc
 ‘Let me not look at things this way!’
- (26)*Hadd ezt a javaslatot tegyem!
 this the proposal.acc make.imp.1sg
 ‘Let me make THIS proposal!’

These examples show the very solid connection between *hadd* and the finite verb, where expressions can intervene whose grammatical and/or semantic properties get integrated with the complex particle + finite verb structure. The looser the relation between inserted expression and complex structure, the less acceptable the resulting order (and the more sparse the instantiating corpus evidence).

Under highly marked circumstances the pronominal first person subject can also be placed between *hadd* and the finite verb:

²¹ Parliamentary Protocols; Éva Mikes, 19.9.1998.

- (27) Hadd én mondjam!
 I say.imp.1sg
 ‘Let ME say it!’ (Overheard example; child language)
- (28) Hadd én tegyem meg azt az utat²²
 I make.imp.1sg perf. that.acc the way.acc
 ‘Let ME make that journey myself.’
- (29) Azt a szép menyasszonyt jaj, hadd én is látom!²³
 that.acc the beautiful bride.acc oh I also see.ind.1sg
 ‘Oh, let ME see this beautiful bride too!’

However, according to my intuition, a subject expressed by a noun (phrase) cannot occur in this position:

- (30) *Hadd Péter mondja!
 Peter say.imp.3sg
 ‘Let PETER say it!’

Concerning the use of the first person singular subject pronoun between *hadd* and the finite verb I can discern a certain parallel between Hungarian 1st-person and German 2nd-person imperative sentences. Elimination of the subject is considered by Altmann (1993) as a categorial feature of the unmarked imperative sentence. Yet, under marked circumstances, the subject pronoun can be realized for pragmatic reasons, e.g., as an expression of particular emphasis or for the purposes of contrast.

- (31) Komm DU! / Kommt IHR! (German)
 come you.sg come you.pl
 ‘YOU come!’

Something similar is what we find in the Hungarian sentence type involving *hadd* and a first person subject. The fact that this pragmatic focusing of the subject pronoun is limited to the 1st-person sentence type²⁴ again shows—as I see it—that the 1st-person form is the sen-

²² Full citation: *Hadd én tegyem meg azt az utat, —úgymond. —Ifjú vagyok és könnyebben kiállhatom a tengeri utazás bajait.* ‘Let ME make this trip, he said. I’m still young and can better tolerate the vicissitudes of a sea journey.’ (Hungarian Historical Corpus; Mihály Fazekas, 1828).

²³ Hungarian Historical Corpus; József Kiss, 1975.

²⁴ It is unclear whether focused 3rd person pronouns can be placed between *hadd* and the finite verb, as in *Hadd ő mondja . . . !* According to my linguistic intuitions

tence type grammaticalized the furthest. In this case, the first person pronoun amalgamates between the proclitic particle *hadd* and the finite verb with both these words and the three together form an inseparable unit. Through this unit an action to be performed is named, and this is accompanied by making salient the fact that this action is to be performed by the speaker.

4. Comparison of Hungarian *hadd*-imperatives with similar constructions in a selection of European languages

In this section it will be shown that by means of lexical items going back to the imperative form of the verb meaning ‘let’, one can paraphrase non-addressee-oriented directives in various European languages. The resulting constructions display partial similarity with respect to their various functions or meanings. This indicates that there are systematic cross-linguistic relations affecting meaning change. To uncover these relations is the main purpose of this section.

This is not to say that the imperative form of the verb meaning ‘let’ develops into a sentence mood particle in all European languages. German, for example, does not have sentence mood particles. Instead, it characteristically possesses constructions based on modal and auxiliary verbs. As will be shown, the verb *lassen* ‘let’, originally functioning in accusative-cum-infinitive environments, is developing into a modal in some of its uses, and into an imperatival auxiliary in others. In Russian, however, where sentence mood particles may play an essential role both in interrogative and imperative sentences, we end up with an imperative particle, which—in some uses—even develops further into an optative or modal particle or a modal subordinating conjunction.

4.1. The English *let* + pronoun + verb construction

As is well known, English has a construction involving the verb *let* that possesses an imperative-like meaning:

(32) Let me tell you. . .

(33) Let’s go!

this is not possible, or, if it were to occur it would be a highly marked and enormously situation-bound construction. I have not found any corpus evidence for this.

In the case of 1pl forms, the most frequent instance of this construction, we even find cliticization of the personal pronoun (something one can also consider a case of univerbation.) There is a meaning difference between the forms with and without a cliticized pronoun. Within the full form *Let us go*, the lexical meaning of the verb *let* is present and its governing properties are observable. Thus, this form counts as a request for permission. *Let's go*, however, is an adhortative form, by which the speaker addresses a directive to a group he or she belongs to him- or herself. For this reason, Quirk et al. (1985, 148) classify the form *let's* not as an auxiliary but as a “pragmatic particle” marking the adhortative sentence type in contrast with the imperative sentence, which is considered unmarked. The same difference cannot be shown for 1sg forms.²⁵ However, it is quite clear that sentences like (32) need not be uttered as requests for permission but can express the speaker's desire to do something and can announce the speech act to follow (with roughly the meaning of ‘I want to tell you something and I will tell it to you’). All in all, we seem to have an imperative auxiliary here, which within the adhortative sentence possesses a particle-like use.

4.2. The Russian particle *pust'/puskaj*

Russian has developed the imperative particle *pust'/puskaj* from the 2sg imperative of the verb *pust'it'/puskat'* ‘let’ (these equivalent variants go back to the aspectually perfective and imperfective forms of the verb, respectively). According to Hrakovskij and Volodin (1986), the main uses of the verb are 3rd person singular and plural, presumably because another particle is more likely to be used with 1st-person forms.²⁶

Given that Russian imperative forms only exist for 2nd person singular and plural, the verb in 3rd person sentences is inflected for the indicative. This means that the particle is the only marker of the sentence being imperative.

²⁵ As far as I know, the colloquial form *lemme* (for *let me*) has not been studied in this respect.

²⁶ *Davaj*, stemming from the imperative form of the verb *davat'* ‘give’. Sporadically one finds examples of *pust'/puskaj* even in sentences with first or even second person.

- (34) (a) Пусть задумается...²⁷
pust' think.3sg.refl
 'One should think it over.'
- (b) Кто из депутатов будет, пусть входят!
 who of delegate.pl.gen will *pust'* enter.3pl
 'May those of the delegates who want to enter enter!'

Also in Russian—as in the case of English adhortative sentences—one can find a formal difference between the sentences with the original meaning of the imperative form of the verb (as request for permission) and non-2nd-person imperative sentences. In the former the pronoun occurs in the accusative (the original governing properties of the verb are thus formally discernible), while in the imperative sentences one can find a nominative personal pronoun (cf. Ožegov 2003, 622):

- (35) Пусть его идет. vs. Пусть он идет.
 let.imp him go.3sg *pust'* he go.3sg
 'Allow him to go!' 'May he go/He shall go!'

According to Hrakovskij and Volodin (1986), even first person imperative sentences can—even if more rarely—be formed with *pust'*/*puskaj*:

- (36) Пусть я расскажу! vs. Пусть мы будем первыми!²⁸
pust' I tell-1sg *pust'* we will.be.1pl first.pl.instr
 'Let me tell!' 'Let us be the first!'

However, 1st person forms predominantly have the meaning 'the desire of the speaker', so these sentences often may rather be classified as optative sentences. Even 3rd person forms can occur in the same function, as shown by the parallel use of *pust'* in the famous anti-war children's song from Soviet times:

- (37) Пусть всегда будет солнце²⁹
pust' always will.be.3sg sun
 'May there always be the sun!'

²⁷ Full citation: *Ну, ну, передай министру: звонил Распутин, звонил гневно. Пусть задумается. Так и передай!* (A. Tolstoj) 'Well, well, hand over to the minister: Rasputin was ringing. He was ringing in a rage. He should think. So, hand it over!'. (34b) by Granin. Examples taken from Hrakovskij–Volodin (1986, 113).

²⁸ Examples from Hrakovskij–Volodin (1986, 114).

This example is evidence for the overlap between non-2nd-person imperatives and optatives. Given that also in the non-2nd-person imperative forms expression of the basic propositional speaker attitude ‘want’ is central for the semantics of the sentence type, the borderline between the two sentence moods cannot be drawn exactly. The same thing we already observed with respect to the Hungarian sentences in (16) and (17), which presumably can be accounted for in terms of the cross-linguistically valid functional overlaps we already sketched.

In other examples—mostly 1st and 2nd person structures—*pust’/puskaj* functions as a concessive conjunction. This shows great similarities to the development of the Hungarian particle *hadd*:

- (38) Пускай ты умер, ...³⁰
puskaj you die.past.2sg
 ‘Although you died, ...’

Example (38) contains a preterite sentence, which means that due to past reference neither an imperatival nor an optative interpretation is possible. Thus, in these cases meaning is construed on an even more abstract level, namely, in terms of concessive interpretation.

In example (39) the particle is used as a modal particle with an epistemic meaning:

- (39) Пусть думают, что ...³¹
pust’ think.3pl that
 ‘Apparently they think that ...’

²⁹ Full citation: *Пусть всегда будет солнце, пусть всегда будет небо, пусть всегда будет мама, пусть всегда буду я.* ‘May there always be the sun, may there always be the sky, may there always be my mother, and may I also always be there.’

³⁰ Full citation: *Пускай ты умер, но в песне смелых и сильных духом всегда ты будешь живым примером.* (Gorkij) ‘Although you died, you nevertheless will always be a living ideal in the songs of those who own a brave and strong soul.’ Example from Hrakovskij–Volodin (1986, 127).

³¹ Full citation: *Вчера не было интернета. Пусть думают, что у меня есть дела поважней* ‘Yesterday the internet didn’t work. Apparently, they think that I have better things to do’ (example from the internet).

4.3. The German verbal complex *lass/lasst* + pronoun + infinitive

The German construction involving the imperative form of the verb *lass/lasst* together with the accusative form of the personal pronoun shows functions similar to the Hungarian and Russian particles we dealt with above. If one starts from the lexical meaning of the verb *lassen*, one can primarily interpret a sentence containing this construction as a request, an expression of the desire that the interlocutor(s) permit, or not prevent, the event expressed. On certain uses, however, the meaning of the construction has become more removed from this original lexical meaning, and converges on an imperative sentence type. There are many intermediate cases, too, whose interpretation is rather subjective. A brief corpus search of Cosmas³² showed that the presence of the lexical meaning of *lassen* depends to a high degree on the person marking of the construction. For 2sg and 2pl cases this meaning clearly shows up in all examples investigated:

- (40) Lass dich nicht verrückt machen!³³

‘Don’t let yourself be irritated!’

- (41) „Lasst euch nicht alles kaputt machen“, rief Urs Wolfensberger knapp zehn Minuten vor Spielende energisch aufs Feld.

‘“Don’t let everything be destroyed,” shouted U.W. energetically onto the field roughly 10 minutes before the end of the match.’

For 1sg and 3sg the interpretation is highly dependent on context. In a context where the event depends on the will, permission, or tolerance of the interlocutor, the lexical meaning of *lassen* ‘let’ gets realized, as shown in (42) and (43). In a situation, however, without any discernible interlocutor such as (44), or a situation in which it is obvious that the interlocutor cannot have any influence on the course of events such as (45), the construction is understood as a non-2nd-person imperative sentence expressing that the speaker wants the event to come about and in addition believes that by uttering these words the event will come about:

- (42) Lasst mich am Sport teilnehmen und gebt mir die Chance, Erfolg zu haben.

‘Let me participate in sports and give me a chance to be successful.’

³² The system for corpus searches of the Institut für Deutsche Sprache in Mannheim (www.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas).

³³ This and the following examples come from Cosmas.

- (43) „Lass ihn gehen, Lina!“, forderte sein Vater seine Mutter noch einmal auf.
 “‘Let him go, Lina,’ his father asked his mother once again.’
- (44) Die letzten Worte von Papst Johannes Paul II. waren: „Lasst mich zum Haus des Vaters gehen.“ Dies geht aus einem Dokument hervor, das der Vatikan in den kommenden Tagen veröffentlichen wird.
 ‘The final words of Pope John Paul II were: “Let me go to our Father’s house.” This can be gathered from a document to be published by the Vatican in the upcoming days.’
- (45) Doch heute will ‚Gauchó‘ die Entscheidung. „Wir haben ihm einen optimierten Zwei-Jahres-Vertrag vorgelegt. Lass ihn nächste Runde 25 Tore schießen und dann ablösefrei gehen. Da würden wir dumm da stehen.“
 ‘But today Gauchó wants the decision: “We offered him an optimized two-year contract. Let him score 25 goals next season and then leave without transfer fee. That would put us in an awkward situation.”’

The only proper interpretation of the final words of Pope John Paul II is that he wants to go to the Father’s house and that he expressed at the same time that by expressing this intention the way there is going to be secured. In example (45) the potential interlocutor, e.g. the reader of the newspaper, has no influence on events. Much rather it is indirectly requested of Gauchó that he score 25 goals. The meaning even gets further abstracted here up to a possible conditional interpretation: ‘If Gauchó were to score 25 goals and then to leave without transfer fee, we would be in an awkward situation’.

In German, the construction is most frequent in so-called adhortative sentences. This sentence type characteristically possesses double person marking. By the pronoun *uns* ‘us’ it is indicated that the people carrying out the action are a group of which both speaker and interlocutor are members. The verbal form of the auxiliary, however, is fixed to 2nd person, singular or plural. Through this, the interlocutors also get addressed (number marking on *lassen* depends—as can be seen in examples (46)–(48)—on the number of people addressed). By means of the sentence type at hand, the speaker addresses the interlocutor(s) and, at the same time, expresses that he or she identifies with them and belongs to the same group.

- (46) Ein feierlicher Antrag sei nicht nötig gewesen, das schlichte „Komm, lass uns heiraten!“ habe genügt, „Ruck-Zuck.“
 ‘No ceremonious proposal is said to have been necessary. A simple “Come on, let’s marry!” is said to have been sufficient, and off they went.’

- (47) „Natürlich sind wir Elfen“, antwortete der Mann. „Komm, meine Elfin“, bat er seine Partnerin, „lass uns weitertanzen.“
 “Of course we are elves,” the man answered. “Come on, my she-elf,” he asked his partner, “let’s go on dancing.”

Within the adhortative sentence the original lexical meaning of the verb *lassen* is no more identifiable. Through it, a group of people are requested to act, and the speaker declares him- or herself to be member of that group (in the basic case we are dealing with a request to the hearer by the speaker). This function can be discerned most definitively when the adhortative sentence involving *lassen* counts as translation of an imperative sentence, as is regularly the case in the language of the Church, where Latin imperative sentences get translated by *lassen* + acc + inf:

- (48) Lasset uns beten! (German)
 Oremus! (Latin)
 ‘Let us pray!’

German has not developed an imperative particle for familiar reasons: The category of sentence mood particle seems to be alien to German. This notwithstanding, *lassen* developed into an imperative auxiliary, which preserved the governing properties of the original accusative-cum-infinitive verb but not its meaning. This auxiliary is developing even further and can—in some uses, as in example (45)—be interpreted as marker of a subordinating discourse relation indicating the conditional semantics of one sentence relative to another. This is highly analogous to the sentence connecting function of Hungarian *hadd* and Russian *pust’/puskaj*, which we described above. It has to be granted though that no formally complex sentence results in German.

Finally, Reis (2001, 308) reports on the following use of *lassen*—close to the use of modal verbs—in which a hunch or assumption of the speaker is expressed:

- (49) A: Was kostet das Buch wohl?
 B: Hm, lass es mal 100,- kosten.
 A: ‘What may this book cost?’ / B: ‘Well, let’s say it costs 100 DM.’

This function comes close to the modal particle function of the Russian particle *pust’* in example (39). Even if the syntactic system of German does not allow the development of sentence mood particles, the cross-linguistically valid meaning relations can be observed in both languages.

The relation of a sentence mood particle to an epistemic modal particle is the same as the one of an auxiliary marking sentence mood to a modal verb.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I wanted to focus on the Hungarian imperative particle *hadd*. I take the main function of this particle, which can be traced back to the imperative form of the verb *hagy* ‘let’, to be that of a sentence mood particle marking non-2nd-person—predominantly 1sg—imperative sentences. However, *hadd* possesses other functions, some of which even lead away from the particle function toward that of a subordinating conjunction. All these subordinating functions can be related to the main function as imperative particle via associative meaning relations.

In addition, I intended to show that similar developments are demonstrable in other European languages. In some languages, the imperative form of the verb meaning ‘let’ changes into particles that display a high degree of similarity to the Hungarian particle, in other languages the verb meaning ‘let’ rather tends toward auxiliarization.

References

- Altmann, Hans 1993. Satzmodus. In: Joachim Jacobs–Arnim von Stechow–Wolfgang Sternefeld–Theo Vennemann (eds): *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*, 1006–29. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Bechner, Barbara–Gizella Nagy–Cristina Onesti–Attila Péteri 2009. Interrogativsätze kontrastiv-typologisch (amades – Arbeitspapiere und Materialien zur Deutschen Sprache 32). IDS, Mannheim.
- Birjulin, Leonid A. – Viktor S. Hrakovskij 2001. Imperative sentences: Theoretical problems. In: Viktor S. Hrakovskij (ed.): *Typology of imperative constructions*, 3–50. LINCOM, München.
- Heine, Bernd–Ulrike Claudi–Friederike Hünemeyer 1991. *Grammaticalization. A conceptual framework*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Hrakovskij, Viktor S. – Aleksandr P. Volodin 1986. Семантика и типология императива. Русский императив [The semantics and typology of imperatives. The Russian imperative]. Isdatel'stvo Nauka, Leningrad.
- Kenesei, István–Robert M. Vago–Anna Fenyevesi 1998. *Hungarian*. Routledge, London & New York.
- Matzel, Klaus–Bjarne Ulvestad 1978. Zum Adhortativ- und Sie-Imperativ. In: *Sprachwissenschaft* 3: 146–83.

- Matzel, Klaus–Bjarne Ulvestad 1985. Ergänzendes zu zwei früheren Veröffentlichungen. In: Sprachwissenschaft 10:1–6.
- Meillet, Antoine 1912. L'évolution des formes grammaticales. In: Antoine Meillet: Linguistique historique et linguistique générale, 130–48. Champion, Paris.
- Ožegov, Sergej Ivanovič 2003. Словарь русского языка [Dictionary of Russian]. Onyx, Moscow.
- Pomozí, Péter 1991. Néhány gondolat a magyar „konjunktívusz”-ról [Some thoughts about the Hungarian “subjunctive”]. In: Dolgozatok a magyar mint idegen nyelv és a hungarológia köréből 26:3–13.
- Quirk, Randolph–Sidney Greenbaum–Geoffrey Leech–Jan Svartvik 1985. A comprehensive grammar of the English language. Longman, London & New York.
- Reis, Marga 2001. Bilden Modalverben im Deutschen eine syntaktische Klasse? In: Reimar Müller–Marga Reis (eds): Modalität und Modalverben im Deutschen. Linguistische Berichte, Sonderheft 9, 287–318. Helmut Buske Verlag, Hamburg.
- Searle, John R. 1985. Expression and meaning. Studies in the theory of speech acts. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Stolz, Thomas 1994. Grammatikalisierung und Metaphorisierung. Brockmeyer, Bochum.
- Szücs, Márta 2010. A *hadd* problémaköre [Problems concerning *hadd*]. In: LingDok 9: 193–214.
- Tompa, József 1968. Ungarische Grammatik. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.
- Vos, Riet–Ludmila Veselovská 1999. Clitic questionnaire. In: Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.): Clitics in the languages in Europe, 891–1099. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin & New York.
- WALS. The world atlas of language structures online. <http://wals.info>.
- Wegener, Heide 1998. Zur Grammatikalisierung von Modalpartikeln. In: Irmhild Barz–Günther Öhlschläger (eds): Zwischen Grammatik und Lexikon, 37–112. Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Weinrich, Harald 1993. Textgrammatik der deutschen Sprache. Dudenverlag, Mannheim.
- Zifonun, Gisela 2001. Grammatik des Deutschen im europäischen Vergleich. In: Studia Linguistica (Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis) 20: 171–86.

Corpora

- Historical Corpus of Hungarian. Magyar Történeti Szövegtár.
<http://www.nytud.hu/hhc/>
- Hungarian National Corpus. Magyar Nemzeti Szövegtár. corpus.nytud.hu/mnsz/
- BUSZI. Sociolinguistic Interviews of the Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences³⁴
- Corpora of the Institut für Deutsche Sprache. www.ids-mannheim.de/cosmas

³⁴ I hereby thank Miklós Kontra for giving me access to this corpus.