

CLAUSE COMBINING IN OLD HUNGARIAN LEGENDS. PROSE AND VERSE, WRITTEN AND ORAL NARRATIVES IN PREACHING

DÓRA BAKONYI

Abstract

The paper explores the ways in which the preaching situation shapes narration and, eventually, the forms of clause linkage, by presenting a few characteristic features of Hungarian, illustrated with early Hungarian linguistic material from the first half of the 16th century. A comparison is made between the syntactic coding of three main coherence strands in three versions of the 'same' narrative, the legend of Saint Catherine of Alexandria, based on a discourse approach to clause combining. A common Latin source text is taken into consideration as well. The exact differences in coding temporal, referent and action continuity are pointed out. It is shown that the differences in the communicative setting are indeed closely reflected in the chosen grammatical forms of clause integration. The results of the analysis shed light on the factors motivating the two opposing forces of elaboration and compression in clause linkage, which were already present in the Late Old Hungarian period. It is shown in the ensuing analysis that these factors correlate with written and oral text features, and genre differences of prose and verse.

The dominant author figure of the era was the translator-compiler-author educated in one of the religious orders in Hungary. Those preachers had helped to shape the linguistic norms of the different text types prevalent in the Middle Ages before linguistic standardization took place.

The discourse potential of time adverbial clauses as coherence bridges at thematic boundaries is shown to have already existed in the period. The type of clause used in the transition between the narrated actions and utterances shows the concise vs. loose nature of event integration as it codes a phase of perceptive acknowledgement in the narration, potentially existing as a building block of an event. Its frequent occurrence signals a high degree of character foregrounding. Considering the written and oral features of the three excerpts, the key concept is character foregrounding. The forms and degrees of giving prominence to the protagonist (Catherine) are mirrored in the explicitness of coding her linguistically. In the verse legend, there is a significant rise in the number of 'phoric pronouns' used in the grammatical integration of subordinate clauses with their main clauses. This can be traced back to the rhythmical constraints of the genre, along with the tendency to uphold a one clause-one rhythmical unit correlation.

1. Introduction

This paper presents a few characteristic features of Hungarian clause linkage, illustrated with early Hungarian linguistic material. The study was published in Hungarian (Bakonyi 2008). The aim of the study is to register the similarities and differences of clause combining phenomena in three versions of the same legend. A comparison is made between the legend

variants, surviving in three Late Old Hungarian¹ religious manuscripts (Érdy-codex 1526: 665a–666b, Debreceni Codex 1519: 491–518, Érsekújvári Codex 1529–31: 447a–464a). The comparison is based on a discourse approach to clause combining. More precisely, the aim is to explore the ways in which the preaching situation shapes the narration and, eventually, forms of clause linkage. The excerpts are parallel sections from versions of the legend of Saint Catherine of Alexandria, chosen to cover the same time-span from the events preceding Catherine’s conception to her first dream before her conversion.

1.1. The wider context of the present study is my PhD project, in which I am to create a linguistically annotated corpus from parts of the Érdy-codex.²

The manuscript itself is currently being edited to be accessible at a website hosted by Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE, <http://sermones.elte.hu>). Based on this new edition of the manuscript, which I am working on as a member of a group, my research plan is to select a corpus of sermons and legends from the codex with the particular goal to develop an innovative linguistic annotation system, which will facilitate retrieving relevant data for the description of Old Hungarian clause combining.

The development of an annotation scheme is still in the preliminary stage of testing the descriptive applicability of various functional approaches to clause combining on the early Hungarian text, and their compatibility with the valuable insights of traditional Hungarian historical linguistics (Balázs 1995; Berrár 1957, 1960; Dömötör 1995, 2001, 2003; Gallasy 1992, 2003; Gugán 2002; Haader 1995, 2003; Hadrovics 1969; Károly 1956, 1995; Klemm 1928; M. Nagy 2003; Molnár 1977; Papp 1995; Simonyi 1881, 1882, 1883; Wacha 1995a, 1995b). Apart from drawing on Functional-Typological Linguistics (Cf. Givón 1990; Lehmann 1988, 2007), I wish to test the descriptive potential of Rhetorical Structure Theory (Matthiessen–Thompson 1988), and Pragmatic Syntax (Jürgens 1999).

Ideally, any linguistic annotation should be as theory-free as possible. Two considerations, however, make it necessary for the researcher to take a firm theoretical and methodological stance in his or her **pre-descriptive** work. On the one hand, one has to delimit the linguistic phenomena to be annotated in order to be able to publish a corpus accessible for descriptive research within a reasonable time. On the other hand, having clear views on the relevant linguistic issues is a prerequisite for the elaboration of any type of linguistic annotation, since those views have an impact on the choice of adequate methodology, and eventually, they might contribute to the provision of a treebank of syntactic structures.

In section **2**, I will discuss how the three surviving Hungarian variants relate to their common Latin source text (**2.1–2.3**). In section **3**, I will present the various features of the three excerpts providing an extensive account of the causes that motivate the shape of clause linkage phenomena (**3.1–3.6**). The aspects of my investigation are as follows: The

¹ The historical periods of the Hungarian language are: Ancient Hungarian (1000 B.C.–896 A.D.), Old Hungarian (896–1526), Middle Hungarian (1526–1772), New Hungarian (1772–1920), Recent Hungarian (1920–now). The manuscript codices surviving to this day were copied in the late 15th – early 16th centuries and constitute the so-called ‘Era of Codices’ in the Late Old Hungarian linguistic (sub)period.

² The Érdy-codex is the longest Hungarian manuscript book surviving to this day, dating from 1526–1527. It is the work of a single author, a member of the Carthusian order, known as the Carthusian Anonym. This one existing copy was not written by him but it is a copy. It contains sermons and legends for the whole religious year. The part containing the sermons is, however, missing most of its material (we only have the sermons from Advent through to carnival). The ‘loss’ dates back to the original binding of the book (i.e. it is not torn or damaged).

legend as narrative discourse. The functional approach to clause linkage (3.1.); Interclausal coherence. The discourse-pragmatic connections of time adverbial clauses (3.2.); Demands placed on coding referent continuity by communicative goals depending on the preaching situation (3.3.); Action continuity in event integration (3.4.); Compression and elaboration phenomena in clause linkage. Written and oral features (3.5.); Event integration in prose and verse (3.6.). At various points in the argumentation, I will provide a brief summary of relevant features of the Hungarian language.

2. The variants and their Latin source

Let me turn to the surviving variants of Saint Catherine's legend. The common Latin source text of all three versions is one of Pelbartus de Themeswar's sermons written for Saint Catherine's feast (*Sermones Pomerii de sanctis II.* [pars aestivalis], 099 D–E³). The relationship of the Hungarian variants to their source has been discussed in detail by Flóra Rajhona (2004: 6–32). It has to be pointed out here that the three surviving texts are not copies of each other, and the only known Latin version common to all three is the source text from which two of them were translated although neither is a very close translation. The third version is a rhyming verse text, which adds a prose-verse genre aspect to the investigation.

2.1. The author of the **Érdy-codex** compiled a single, very long and complicated sermon (ÉrdyK. 656–675) by translating and reorganizing 98% of four of Pelbartus's sermons (Rajhona 2004: 12). 'The sections added to Pelbartus's text are in fact explanatory remarks which the Carthusian Anonym inserted for better understanding by the audience. Since the Hungarian text was created for nuns who did not speak Latin, it is no surprise that the author had chosen well-known texts as his source material'⁴ (Rajhona 2003, my translation).

The Érdy author placed the legend of Saint Catherine at the end of his sermon (665b–672a). Rajhona further points out that, while highlighting the meaning of the theological discussion and explaining the words of the quoted church authorities, the Carthusian Anonym presents the easy-to-follow legend in a short and condense style⁵ (Rajhona 2003, my translation). The Anonym conveys Pelbartus's legend (sermon 099, parts D–E) in Hungarian without making any major modifications to the story. The reason for the legend being a close translation of the Latin source text is to ensure that the narrative is easily understood by the audience compared to the ensuing theological argumentation. The re-telling of the story is so concise that ten minor details of Pelbartus's text are omitted. All of them can, however, be found in the Debreceni version.

The linguistic choices of the Anonym in the excerpt analysed here (665a–666b) are typical for Late Old Hungarian translations. There is a tendency to translate Latin infinitival

³ Pelbartus wrote four sermons for Saint Catherine of Alexandria in this volume, the texts are available at:
<http://emc.elte.hu/pelbart/pa099.html>,
<http://emc.elte.hu/pelbart/pa100.html>,
<http://emc.elte.hu/pelbart/pa101.html>,
<http://emc.elte.hu/pelbart/pa102.html>.

⁴ „Azok a részek, amelyek hiányoznak a Pelbartusi prédikációkból, tulajdonképpen egyszerűsítő, magyarázó szövegek, amelyek a könnyebb értést segítik. Mivel a kódex alapvetően latinul nem tudó apácáknak készült, érthető, hogy miért közismert és mindennapos szövegeket választott a szerző.”

⁵ „A teológiai fejtegetésekben, ill. az egyházatyák bonyolult nyelvű szövegeinek fordításakor terjedelmesen igyekszik elmagyarázni azok értelmét, míg a legenda könnyen érthető cselekményét röviden, tömören adja elő.”

and participial constructions into separate Hungarian clauses (on cases of structural synonymy and formal variants, see: Dömötör 2003; Gugán 2002; Károly 1956). There are only a few cases in which the Érdy translation is so close to the original version that it reflects even the Latin grammatical forms.

- (1) a. [...], et errando huc atque illuc divina providentia invenerunt quendam sanctum senem **in cella orantem**, qui supra cacumen cellae **habebat** imaginem Crucifixi **erectam**. (Pelbartus)
- (1) b. Azonközben Úr Istennek akaratójából találának egy szent vén remetét **cellájában imádkozván**, kinek cellája fölött egy ércből szerzett feszület kép **vala feltéven**. (ÉrdyK. 666a/18–22)⁶
[Meanwhile, by the Lord's intention, they found a holy old hermit **praying in his cell**, above whose cell **there was placed** a crucifix made of ore.]⁷

Cf. DebrK.:

- (1) c. Találának ezenközben egy vén szent jámbort, **ki lakozik vala ott** az pusztában, **és ez szent vén jámbor** az ő cellája felett **feltette vala** Urunk Jézusnak az ő feszületit. (DebrK. 507/13–18)
[Meanwhile, they found an old holy hermit, **who dwelled there** in the wild, **and this holy old pious man had placed** the crucifix of Our Lord Jesus above his cell.]

2.2. In contrast, the author of the **Debreceni Codex** produces a *de sanctis* sermon (491–557) by only including the life story from the Latin source (sermon 099, parts D-E⁸) and interpolating in it at various points (13 times). The preacher takes every opportunity to comment on good conduct when addressing his audience of young women. The parallel excerpt under investigation in this paper (491–518) is three times longer than the Érdy excerpt which contains only one interpolation by the narrator. Nevertheless, addressing the audience is but one of the many reasons on the part of the author to spin out his tale.

The most important reason is the author's intention to transform Pelbartus's short Latin *vita* into an independent sermon, suitable for oral performance. One way of achieving this is for the narrator to bring the characters more into the foreground than they were in the Latin version. This means mentioning them more often and letting them speak their own words. However, it is obvious that in this Hungarian sermon, some distinct features of the original written text are preserved, and that the 'oral' linguistic material was built upon them. Direct quotations are close transformations of the Latin indirect quotes as they tend to follow the

⁶ Abbreviations are listed at the end of the paper. The original spelling of the quoted excerpts quoted here has been transcribed respecting Modern Hungarian spelling conventions and graphemic usage for the sake of easier reading.

⁷ The English translations of the Old Hungarian excerpts provided in square brackets are my translations, for the purpose of presenting the analysis. However, they do not reflect any of the archaic features of the Old Hungarian passages.

⁸ Another source of the Debreceni Codex *de sanctis* sermon (of sections not analysed in this paper): Oswaldus de Lasko, *De sancta Katherina virgine et martyr*. Sermo CX-CXI. in: *Sermones de Sanctis, Biga salutis intitulati* (Rajhona 2004: 14).

translated indirect speech itself (see examples in 3.3.). The outcome of these repetitions is not a smooth narrative style, but a rather clumsy one.

Furthermore, this Hungarian version is characterized by a translation strategy, namely that pairs of words conveying the same notion in two ways are present throughout the story. As a result the text abounds in conjunctive constructions of the explanatory type. The translator expresses one notion in the source language with the help of two in the target language (on their typology, see M. Nagy 2003). This may be intended for a better understanding by the audience, but it is more likely to be a remnant of the translation process.

- (2) a. [...], qui non vult **habere** sponsam **nisi semper castam manentem**, (Pelbartus)
- (2) b. Ez királynak fia kediglen nem akar egyéb jegyest magának **venni avagy választani**, hanem csak **ki mindaha tisztaságot akar tartani, és hogy mindenkoron tisztaságban ő jegyese megmaradjon**. (DebrK. 512/12–18)
[And this son of a king will not **take or choose** any other sponse than **who will forever keep chastity, and that his sponse remain in chastity forever.**]

As the above example shows, not only words, but also clauses are doubled in this way. The Érdy author, by contrast, seems to have had no such difficulties when translating:

- (3) [...], ki egyéb jegyöst soha nem **szeret, hanem ki mindenkoron szeplőtelen**, (ÉrdyK. 666b/5–6)
[who will never **love** any sponse other **than one who is forever immaculate,**]

2.3. The third variant, surviving in the *Érsekújvári Codex* (447a–520a), comes in a rhyming verse form and is five times longer than the Érdy excerpt. Pelbartus is known to be among its sources, but the author must have relied on some vernacular verse variants other than Hungarian: the section before Catherine's conception is much more detailed than in the prose excerpts (Rajhona 2004: 13). This excerpt (447a–464a) begins with a *Prologus*, an introduction to the *de sanctis* sermon, with the legend as its frame. There are fewer interpolations here than in the Debreceni version (only 9). However, some examples of two fictional text types are embedded in the text: one direct quotation from Catherine's father in the form of a letter, and a sermon preached by the hermit to Catherine, included in their dialogue. This version also features Latin 'titles of episodes' in the text referring to the story, but not fitting into the Hungarian verse (e.g. 449b/22–23: „De vocatione et actibus Alphorabii etc.”), just as the Latin quotations in the interpolations.

Some distinct features of this variant are due to its verse form as opposed to the other two prose versions (to be introduced in 3.6.). The copy in the ÉrsK. has its verse rhythm deliberately ignored at various points in the text, where missing oblique complements had been inserted at 'line ends'. The text is laid out in two columns, but the lines do not correspond to the units of verse rhythm. A later hand marked these units by vertical lines and crossed out the grammatical but unrhymical insertions. It is not known whether the scribe, Soror Márta Sövényházi made the insertions herself or she merely copied the deformed verse text, aiming at a close copy of her original, and not bothering about aesthetic injustice and the possible reconstruction of rhythm and rhyme.

3. Aspects of the investigation

3.1. The legend as narrative discourse. The functional approach to clause linkage

The legend is considered as a narrative text type with the possibility of including dialogues if the narrator chooses to relate the characters' encounters in the form of direct quotations. Of the numerous characteristics of narratives discussed in the literature (cf. Beaugrande–Dressler 2001), the most relevant for the purpose of the present analysis is the observation that narrative discourse relies primarily on the temporal sequence of events. Therefore, in the analysis of discourse structure, the ordering of events is among the most prominent research questions.

In a functional approach to clause linkage, the forms of clause integration are taken to be reflecting the cognitive relationship between states of affairs (Lehmann 1988: 218). Talmy Givón (1990: 826) suggests an iconic relationship between event integration and clause integration: 'The more two events/states are integrated semantically or pragmatically, the more will the clauses that code them be integrated grammatically'.

Christian Lehmann (1988: 214–218) claims in his typology of clause linkage that two opposing forces are at work: the first acts towards the elaboration of lexical and grammatical information, while the opposite force acts towards compression. "Clause linkage may be viewed as either representing two states of affairs so tightly interconnected that they form one complex state of affairs (compression), or on the contrary analyzing one state of affairs as composed of two (elaboration)" (217–218). Lehmann proposes a combination of the two methodological viewpoints implied by the two forces, which is justified because they are complementary. He establishes six distinct parameters relevant to clause linkage, which are construed as six parallel continua, all of them extending from a pole of maximal elaboration to a pole of maximal compression. He then comments on individual correlations and implications between pairs of the parameter continua. However, he emphasizes that none of these are laws, but rather tendencies, which is the very reason for the need to think of separate parameters.

3.2. Interclausal coherence

In functional-typological linguistics, discourse process phenomena are considered relevant in the syntactic research of clause linkage. Givón considers clausal coordination and subordination among the discourse-oriented sub-systems of grammar, suggesting that syntax jointly codes two distinct functional realms: propositional semantics and discourse pragmatics (1984: 40). The components of event integration, i.e. the four main strands of thematic coherence in discourse which are most commonly and systematically coded by grammar are: referent continuity, temporal continuity, location continuity and action continuity (1990: 827).

In this paper, the syntactic coding of three out of four coherence strands are examined and compared in the three manuscript excerpts: 1. Time adverbial clauses are examined with regard to their various functions in coding temporal continuity. 2. The differences in coding referent continuity arise from the degrees of character foregrounding. 3. Action continuity is explored in connection with the building blocks of events. I arrive at the conclusion that as a consequence of character foregrounding, event integration becomes looser.

3.2.1. The discourse-pragmatic connections of time adverbial clauses

Discussing the discourse-pragmatic connections of adverbial clauses, Givón calls attention to the fact that these differ when the clauses are preposed and postposed. Preposed adverbial clauses have wider-scoped anaphoric contextual grounding. Both their referential and semantic links project far backward into the preceding discourse. Syntactically, preposed adverbial clauses are more likely to be separated from their main clause by an intonational break or pause. Lastly, they appear more typically at paragraph initial positions, i.e. at the point of thematic discontinuity. Givón concludes that preposed adverbial clauses may be viewed as **coherence bridges** at major thematic junctures. Their bridging capacity is further aided by their cataphoric semantic connections to the main clause (1990: 847).

In Late Old Hungarian, time adverbial clauses already have the role of coding temporal (dis)continuity. Preposed *mikoron* ('when')-conjunction clauses are used primarily in the Érdy-version (14 times) to introduce new sequences of events.

At thematic breaks, the time adverbial conjunction places the upcoming event in a temporal relation to the succeeding event coded by its main clause (typically in a precedence or immediate precedence relation). When there is a break in referent continuity (subject or object), it is coded by an additional element in the ÉrdyK. (*Mikoron azért* 'so when', *Ki mikoron* 'who, when').

- (4) a. **Qui** consideratis sapienter regis et reginae complexionibus, iudicavit, quod non ex defectu naturae hoc esset, sed divina providentia. (Pelbartus)
- (4) b. **Ki mikoron** megismerte volna természetöket, megmondá, hogy nem természetnek fogyatkozásából volna, de isteni szörzésből. (ÉrdyK., 665a/24–27)
[**Who, when** he had observed their complexions, told them that it was not of nature's failure, but of divine intent.]
- (5) a. **Cumque** in templum idolorum induxissent erigendum, ecce omnia idola ibi existentia corruerunt. Sacrificiis completis visa est post aliquot dies regina a rege gravidata, [...] (Pelbartus)
- (5) b. **Mikoron** az bálványok templomában vitték volna feltenni, íme ottan mind lehullának az bálván képök. **Mikoron azért** az feszületnek áldozatot tett volna az Costus király, hamar való napon teröhbén esék az királyné asszon, [...] (ÉrdyK., 665b/5–10)
[**When** they took it to the shrine of the idols to erect it, alas, immediately all the idols dropped. **When** Costus had payed sacrifices to the crucifix, soon the Lady Queen conceived, ...]
- (6) a. **Tandem** pater eius mortem infirmatur et vocata Katerina commisit sibi testamento. (Pelbartus)
- (6) b. **Mikoron azért** Costus király, szûz leány Katerinának atyja, halálra kórult volna, eleiben hívatá õ szép leányát, és testamentom szerént ímez két dolgot hagyá õnéki, [...] (ÉrdyK., 665b/29–34)

[**When** King Costus, father of the virgin Catherine, became deadly ill, he summoned his fair daughter, and by testament he left her these two things, (...)]

- (7) a. **Et tandem** lassata fletibus obdormivit, et videbat ecce [...] (Pelbartus)
- (7) b. **És mikoron** elbágyadott volna, elszendörödék, és ilyen álmát kezdte látni: (ÉrdyK., 666b/31–33)
[**And when** she had languished, she fell asleep, and began to see this dream:]

In the DebrK. excerpt, *hogy* ('as')-conjunction clauses are prevalent besides *mikoron*-conjunction ('when') clauses:

- (8) **Ki mikort** eljött volna, és **kit** ez királynak eleibe bevettek volna, mondá néki ez király kérdésképpen: (DebrK. 492/10–13)
[**Who, when** he had arrived, and **who** was taken to see the King, the King said to him by inquiry:]
- (9) **És ezt hogy** megmondotta volna, (DebrK. 494/19.)
[**And as** he had said this,]

In the ÉrsK., immediate precedence is coded by *menyé* ('as soon as')-conjunction clauses apart from *mikoron* clauses:

- (10) **Mikoron** eljutott volna, / király ötet nagy tisztességgel fogada. (ÉrsK. 451a/1–3)
[**When** he had arrived, / the King received him with due respect.]
- (11) **Menyé** e szót elvégezé [t.i. Alforabius], / király ottan csak elkezdé / az áldozatot tétetni, / és az Isten kedvét keresni. (ÉrsK. 452b/21–25)
[**As soon as** he had said these words (i.e. Alforabius), / the King thereupon began / paying the sacrifice, / and trying to please the God.]

Besides the temporal relation, a causal relation can appear at thematic junctures:

- (12) a. sed multo tempore prole caruit. **Unde** diis impendebat multa sacrificia ut paganus pro prole habenda, (Pelbartus)
- (12) b. de magzatja nem leszén vala. **Annakokáért** is szentlen való áldozatokat tétszen vala az bálványisteneknek, (ÉrdyK. 665a/12–15)
[but (the King) could not have a child. **Therefore**, he ceaselessly kept paying sacrifices to the pagan gods]
- (12) c. emaga őnéki nem leszén vala magzatja avagy gyermeke nagy sok időtől fogva. **Annakokáért** az bálványisteneknek nagy sok áldozatot tétszen vala, hogy őnéki magzatot adnának. (DebrK. 491/17–22)
[However, [the King] could not have a child or offspring for a long time.]

Therefore, he frequently paid sacrifices to the pagan gods to make them let him have a child.]

Another widespread coding device at thematic junctures is *azért* in the ÉrdyK. As the examples show, it occurs together with the conjunction *mikoron*, typically introducing subject shift. It can be found in the DebrK. as well (*No azért hogy...*). In the ÉrsK., *így* ('thus') has a similar role, but with an additional meaning of consequence:

- (13) *Így* Katerina felkele, / és beméne az cellába. / Ott ő egy vénembert láta, / kinek ilyen kérdést monda: [...] (ÉrsK.: 458a/16–20)
 [Thus, Catherine arose / and entered the cell. / There, she saw an old man, / whom she asked this question: ...]

In the DebrK., a further signpost of thematic boundaries is *No immár* (also occurring together with the conjunctions *mikoron* and *hogy*: *No immáran mikoron*, *No immár hogy*), which is a markedly oral phrase.

3.3. Demands placed on coding referent continuity by communicative goals depending on the preaching situation

It is important to note that the aim of narrating any legend is religious instruction by setting an example by telling the life and miracles of a saint. This is precisely the reason why the narrated story may change over time in accordance with the illustrative and instructive goals of the authors. Indeed, the early texts in the corpus of Saint Catherine's legend did not include circumstances of her birth and of her conversion (Rajhona 2004: 6–7). In addition, it is especially fruitful to examine event integration in a narrative text type such as the legend, because it displays several ways that may affect the audience. One of them is to let the characters speak and thus bring them closer to the hearts of those listening or reading. This is attested in the Debreceni and the Érsekújvári versions although not in the same manner.

When comparing legend variants, several differences can be noted regarding the prominence of the characters, i.e. the number of times that they are mentioned in the discourse, and whether events are narrated directly, or can be reconstructed from their dialogues, etc. These differences are due to varying communicative requirements. That is, it depends on the type of audience the author addresses whether he pushes the characters into the foreground and lets them speak for themselves, or he narrates the story keeping the characters in the background.

In the Érdy-codex the dominant point of view is that of the narrator. Therefore, the narrative answers the question 'What happened?' by recounting successive events, even some of the interactions of the characters are just mentioned to have happened instead of quoting their fictional dialogues. There are altogether 22 utterances mentioned (4) or quoted (18) in the excerpt.

- (14) **Az bölcs doktornak tanácsából** nevezé őtet az csodaléletről, hogy az bálványok eltöretének, Katerinának, ki közönséges bálvánisteneknek romlásának magyaráztatik. (ÉrdyK. 665b/12–17)
 [On the wise doctor's advice, he [King Costus] named her after the miracle of ruining the pagan idols, Catherine, which means „common ruin of pagan gods”]

The characters themselves are in the background. There are few direct quotes (8) and some more indirect quotes (10), and the author uses performative verbs: *parancsol* ‘order’, *megtilt* ‘prohibit’, *kér* ‘ask’, *tanácsol* ‘advise’, etc.

- (15) a. De az bölcs **megtiltá őket, mondván:** – Miért az Nagy Istennek ilyen ábráz kellett, maradjon azon. (ÉrdyK. 665b/2–4)
[But the wise man **prohibited them, saying:** ‘Since the Great God wanted this form of sculpture, it shall remain thus.’]

Cf. DebrK.:

- (15) b. Ezt látván ez természettudó mester, kinek vala neve Alforabius. És **monda** az királynak: – Semmiképpen el ne törd! –, és **megtiltá** az királyt, **hogy** el ne törné ez képet. **És monda** az királynak: – Minekokáért kellemetes volt az Nagy Istennek, hogy ekképpen légyen, légyen úgy, és ekképpen megmaradjon ez feszült kép: mert ez az Nagy Istennek ő képe. (Debreceni Kódex, 496/15–24)
[Seeing this, the master of nature’s laws, by the name Alforabius, **said** to the King: ‘Do not by any means destroy it!’, **and prohibited** the King **from** destroying the image. **And he said** to the King: ‘Since the Great God had pleasure in this image, be it so, and this crucifix image shall remain as it is, for this is the image of the Great God himself.’]

The latter excerpt illustrates an important strategy of the Debreceni-author to foreground the characters. It has to be pointed out here that in addition to the 22 utterances registered in the Érdy version, there are 21 extra quotations which are mainly paraphrases of the first utterances in reported speech.

Quoting the characters’ words means that the author frequently mentions them as main discourse participants in quotative clauses. The Debreceni author always makes it clear who is addressing whom in the dialogue. A distinct function of the palatal definite article in Old Hungarian religious manuscripts is ‘marker of primary topic’ (*főtémakiemelő*, Gallasy 2003: 574–575), which is frequently used with the characters by the Debreceni author. The definite article developed from the far-pointing nominal demonstrative pronoun *az* (‘that’) > OldH. *az* (‘the’) > ModH. *az* ~ *a* (allomorphy conditioned by the first phoneme of the following word). It evolved over the Old Hungarian period, in parallel with the development of two distinct paradigms of verbal inflection, which indicate the definiteness/indefiniteness of the object. The palatal form of the definite article evolved from the near-pointing demonstrative pronoun *ez* (‘this’) > *ez* (‘the’). Although it is marginally used as such, its textual use (marker of primary topic) was rather systematic in Old Hungarian religious text types. Nevertheless it is important to note that there is an additional phenomenon to take into account in Old Hungarian manuscripts regarding palatal pronouns (either definite or phoric). Several manuscripts are considered to be generally favouring palatal forms, the Debreceni Codex and the Érsekújvári Codex among them (Haader 1993: 136, cited in Dömötör 2001: 364). Consequently, the following data and figures of markers of main topic in the three excerpts analyzed in the present paper may be interpreted in ways that are different from my conclusions.

In the DebrK., there are 100 palatal definite articles (*ez*) and 151 *az* forms. Not only Catherine’s, but all the other main characters’ names (and nouns designating them) occur

with the palatal definite article at least once. Catherine is given the greatest importance: out of the 58 *ez* articles used with the main characters (e.g. *ez (dicsőséges) szent Katerina, ez szűz Katerina, ez (szent, nemes, tisztesség, gyengesség) szűz*, etc.), 22 are used in relation to her. The second ‘most important’ character, it seems, is the old hermit with 16 (e.g. *ez vén, ez (szent) vén (jámbor), ez (vén) pusztába lakozandó (jámbor)*), as third come King Costus and doctor Alforabius with 10–9 (e.g. *ez Costus király, ez király, ez atyja; ez doktor, ez bölcs doktor, ez pogány bölcs, ez bölcs/Alforabius természettudó bölcs/doktor/mester*). The Lady Queen remains in the background: her name is only mentioned together with the article *ez* once. In addition to the above, there are 42 palatal articles standing before the other nouns in this version.

By contrast, the Érdy version lacks this form of distinction altogether. The article *ez* is used only twice, once with Catherine, and once with the hermit (*ez szűz leány Katerina, ez vénember*). There are altogether seven occurrences of *ez* along with 46 *az* forms.

Interestingly, the Érsekújvári variant does seem to make use of the palatal definite article (42 occurrences, as opposed to 110 *az* forms), but we can only find nine examples of it in the linguistic coding of the characters (Catherine 7 times: *ez Katerinát, ez szűz, ez leány*, Doctor Alforabius and the hermit once each: *ez mesternek, ez remete*).

3.4. Action continuity in event integration

The author (in the role of narrator) is free to construct events solely through character interactions, if he chooses to. It has to be noted that character interactions are not the same as their dialogues. In all three of the examined legend excerpts, the point of view of the narrator is prevalent throughout the story. Clauses such as *Ezt látván, / Ezt hallván, / Ezeket hogy látta volna, / Ezeket hogy hallá, (monda)* [‘Seeing/Hearing/Having seen/heard this, (he/she said)’] can provide transition between narrated actions and utterances. In this paper, I claim that the low frequency of this type of transition clause indicates condense event integration on the part of the narrator. The Érdy-version has only two such constructions, and one of them is meant in the concrete sense of the verb, i.e.:

(16) a. **Qua visa** ait Katerina intra se dicens (Pelbartus)

(16) b. Mikoron **azt látta volna** szűz leány Katerina, mondá őmagában [...] (ÉrdyK., 666a/22–24)
[When Catherine saw it (i.e. the crucifix made of ore), she said to herself...]

The other example signals turn-taking in the dialogue between Catherine and the hermit:

(17) a. **Tunc** nutu Dei coepit Katerina desiderare ardentem, quis esset ille [...] (Pelbartus)

(17) b. **Azt hallván** szűz leány Katerina, Úr Istennek malasztja szívét megszállván, kezd nagy gerjedetességgel kérdezni, ki volna [...] (ÉrdyK. 666b/9–14)
[**Hearing this**, Catherine, inspired by the Lord’s grace, began fervently to inquire about...]

By contrast, in the Debreceni-excerpt, the above mentioned type of clause is commonly used to express that a character realizes what happened. In a sense, that can be regarded as a

looser form of event integration. However, this does not entail a shift of point of view: it is the narrator who relates the chain of events. The following example shows the difference in the Érdy and the Debreceni versions. The introduction of doctor Alforabius into the story and the King asking him for help in Pelbartus and in the Érdy versions reads:

(18) a. Unde diis impendebat multa sacrificia ut paganus pro prole habenda, sed quia daemones non possunt creare animam humanam, nil sibi haec profuerunt. Interea quidam **philosophus, nomine Alforabius, fuit** in Graecia, magnus et famosus. **Quem rex audiens missis ad se accersuit, et ipsum interrogavit, unde** hoc sibi foret, quod prolem ex regina non haberet. (Pelbartus)

(18) b. Annakokáért is szentetlen való áldozatokat tészon vala az bálván isteneknek, de semmit nem használ vala véle, mert az ördögök embert nem teremthetnek, sem lelköt. **Vala kedég** azon időben Geregországbán **egy** hatalmas természettudó bölcs **doktor, kinek Alforabius vala neve. Hívatá hozzá azt** az Costus királ, **és tudakozék meg rajta, ha** ő volna-e oka, avagy az királné asszon, hogy magtalanok volnának. (ÉrdyK. 665a/17–24)

[Therefore, (the King) ceaselessly kept paying sacrifices to the pagan gods, but those were of no use to himself whatsoever, since devils cannot create humans, nor souls. **There was** in that time in Greece a mighty, wise **doctor** of nature's laws, **named Alforabius. Him** King Costus **summoned, and asked him whether** he or his wife the Lady Queen would be the reason why they were childless.]

Cf. the Debreceni excerpt:

(18) c. Annakokáért az bálván isteneknek nagy sok áldozatot tészon vala, hogy néki magzatot adnának, demaga miért az ördögök embernek lelkét nem teremthetnek, annakokáért ez sok áldozat semmit néki nem használ vala. **Ezenközbe hogy igen áldoznék, hallá, hogy volna** Geregországnak egyik tartományába **egy** nagy mondhatatlan és híres természettudó és ismerő mester és **doktor, kinek vala neve Alforabius. Kit ez király hallván,** legottan leveleket írata, és **követeket bocsáta utána. Ki** mikort eljött volna, és **kit** ez királynak eleibe bevettek volna, **mondá néki ez király kérdésképpen:** – De jó doktor, **mond meg énnem, hogy** honnan vagyon énnem ez, hogy magzatom nem léssen: királynéasszonytól vagyon-e, avagy kediglen éntőlem-e? (Debreceni Kódex, 491/19–23, 492/1–17)

[Therefore, (the King) frequently paid sacrifices to the pagan gods, in order to make them let him have a child, but since the devils cannot create human souls, his sacrifices were of no use to himself whatsoever. **While he was busily paying sacrifices, he heard that** in a far place in Greece, **there was a** highly famous **doctor** of nature's laws, **named Alforabius. On hearing that,** then the King **had** letters written, and **messengers sent after him. Who,** when arriving at court and brought before the King, **the King said to him by inquiry:** 'Good Doctor, tell me, whence did it befall me that I cannot have a child: from the Lady Queen, or from myself?']

The first mention of the wise doctor is a telling example of the difference in the degree of character foregrounding displayed in the two texts. In the Érdy-codex, the narrator simply asserts using a presentative construction *Vala egy bölcs doktor* ('There was a wise doctor'), while in the DebrK., it is pointed out that the King, 'while busily attending to his sacrifices, heard that there was a famous doctor'. The assertion still comes from the narrator.

From the next clause, *Kit ez király hallván* ('On hearing that,') it is obvious that there is a distinct phase of **perceptive acknowledgement**, attributed to the King by the narrator. It has an existence of its own as a reference point in the narration of the sequence of events, just like the act of paying sacrifices in the preceding clause complex. It is restated in a preposed less finite clause (cf. Givón 1990: 838–839) functioning as time adverbial, to which the next event, *legottan leveleket írata* ('then the King had letters written') is then linked. It is important to note here that phrases of perceptive acknowledgement are coded grammatically in the form of more or less finite time adverbial clauses. In this respect, they are in fact preposed clauses coding temporal continuity. It can be observed here is that the characters' interactions can be broken down into either more or less phases in the construction of sequences of events. More emphasis on the characters themselves results in more detailed event integration, which, in turn, is realized by way of more elaborate grammatical forms.

Another sequence of events constructed in a similar way in the two legends, respectively, is the advice of Alphorabius, King Costus acting on it, and the miracle of the golden statue of the Greatest God changing into a crucifix. In Pelbartus and the Érdy version, this reads:

(19) a. **Consuluit** ergo Alphorabius regi ex auro optimo fundere imaginem magno deo deorum et illi pro habenda prole sacrificare. **Adquievit rex et dedit aurum artificibus**, qui disposuerunt fundere imaginem magni regis purpurati et coronati, ac nomen imposuerunt deus deorum. (Pelbartus)

(19) b. **Tanácsot ada** azért királynak az Alforabius doktor, **hogy** az Egy Istennek képét öntetné meg tiszta aranyból, és önéki tenne áldozatot magzatnak lételéért. **Mikoron azért az ötvös mestereknek aranyat adott volna**, az mesterek szerzének egy nagy hatalmas király példát, és nevet adának néki, hogy Isteneknek Istene lenne. **De** az Teremtő Úristen más ábrázatra fordítottá az mestereknek szándékokat, és mikoron megöntötték volna, láták hát: íme, egy feszület. (ÉrdyK., 665a/36–49)

[Therefore, doctor Alphorabius **advised** the King **to** cast the image of the Only God out of pure gold, and pay sacrifices to it for a child to be conceived. **When he issued gold to the goldsmith masters**, the masters forged an image of a mighty king, and they called it the God of Gods. **But** the Lord Creator diverted the intentions of the masters, and when they moulded it, they saw that, alas, it was a crucifix.]

Cf. the Debreceni excerpt:

(19) c. Annakokáért ez Alforabius természetű doktor **tanácsot ada** az királynak, **és monda önéki mondván**: – Felsőges király, hozattass szépségű aranyat nagy béven, és csináltass avagy öntess az aranyból az Egy Istennek képét, ki Isteneknek Istenének mondatik, és Királyoknak Királyának, és Uralkodóknak Urának. – (PRÉDIKÁTOR KISZÓLÁSA) **És ezt hogy megmondotta volna**,

hogy az nagy Istennek képét megcsináltatná, és ennek áldoznák, és hogy ha ezt tenné, hogy néki magzatja lenne; **ezt hallván az király, megörüle ezen, és jóvá hagyá ez tanácsot.** És igen hamar hívata nagy bölcs ötvös mestereket, és hozata nagy sok aranyat, *és parancsola, és monda* az mestereknek, *hogy* öntenének az Nagy Istennek egy igen szép képet, mely isten Minden Isteneknek Istene. *Az ötvös mesterek ezt hallván készek lének a királynak parancsolatira,* és csinálának formát, azaz Istennek ábrázát, avagy képét. **És mondá az király, hogy** (hogy nézzen ki a szobor). *Ez meglévén,* megolvasták az aranyat, és megönték az istennek képét. Mikoron kediglen kivették volna az kohból, és kivévék az formából, **hát íme** az arany bársonyos királynak ő képe változott avagy önttetett mi Urunk Jézusnak feszületinek ő képére, miképpen figgett az magas keresztfán. (Debreceni Kódex, 494/3–10, 19–25, 495/1–9, 14–24)

[Therefore, Alphorabius, doctor of nature's laws, **gave advice** to the King, **and said to him, saying:** 'Your Highness, let shining gold be issued abundantly, and have a sculpture made of the Only God, who is called God of Gods, and King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.' (PREACHER'S INTERPOLATION) **And after he had said this, that** (the King) should have a sculpture made of the Great God, and pay sacrifices to it, and if he did this, he would have a child; **upon hearing this, the King rejoiced and consented to the advice.** **And soon he called wise goldsmith masters,** and issued lots of gold, and **ordered and said** to the masters **that** they cast a beautiful image of the Great God, who is the God of All Gods. **The goldsmith masters, hearing this, were ready to perform the King's orders,** and prepared a mould, that is, of God's image. And the King told them (what the image should look like). *This having been done,* the masters moulded the gold, and cast the image of God. When they took it out of the smelter, and took it out of the mould, **alas,** the image of a velvety king had transformed into the crucifix of Our Lord Jesus.]

The Debreceni author does not merely use the characters' perceptive acknowledgement as building blocks of the narrative structure, but when he returns to the storyline after having interpolated as preacher, he rephrases the words of the wise doctor in order to be able to link to them the next unit, the acknowledgement of the advice. This makes it obvious that **speech acts** constitute events in the Debreceni excerpt, in addition to perceptive acknowledgement. Alphorabius's advice is accepted by the King, who gives orders to his goldsmiths, who obey the orders, etc.

In the Érdy version, the King's action following the advice is related in the form of a proposed *mikoron* ('when')-clause:

- (20) (= part of (19) b.) **Mikoron azért az ötvös mestereknek aranyat adott volna,** az mesterek szerzének egy nagy hatalmas király példát (ÉrdyK., 665a/41–44)
 [**When he issued gold to the goldsmith masters,** the masters forged an image of a mighty king].

There is no anaphoric link to the advice itself, neither is the acknowledgement of the advice narrated. The act of issuing gold opens a separate sequence, in a way 'backgrounded' by being realized in the form of an adverbial clause. Furthermore, there is no mention of giving orders. At this point in the story, there is an omission of the details of how the golden

sculpture is supposed to look like. These details are present in the Latin source text. By contrast, they are there and even further elaborated on in the Debreceni version.

In the Érsekújvári verse legend, a lengthy advice of Alphorabius, in a direct quote, is followed by the narration of the King acting on it, but without either foregrounding the phase of perceptive acknowledgement, or backgrounding the action.

- (19) d. – Azért **fogadd tanácsomat**: nyitassad meg tárházadat, adj aranyat kíméletlen, és ne légy ebben hitetlen! Egy nagy bölcs mestert kerestess, és egy arany képet önttess. Azt hirdessed mindeneknek, hogy ez Istene Isteneknek. Ennek tisztességet tétesz, és áldozatot szereztess. Kivel neki kedvét lelöd, és kivel kívánságod vésszed. Mert ez ő maga talántál, kinek még te nem szolgáltál, ki az Istenek közül tehet néköd szükségedről. – **Ezt az király megtéteté**, és kénccset **el-kiemelteté**. És a mester **kezéhez adatá** kíméletlen sok aranyat. Ki az példát felállatá, és mint bálvánt, úgy faragtatá. Sőt az képet ha megönté, az kép ötet nem követé: mert nem lén bálván szabású, de krucifixom ábrázú. (Érsekújvári Kódex 452a/9–33)

[Therefore, **take my advice**: open the treasury, issue lots of gold, and do not have any doubts! Call for a great wise master and have a golden image cast. Announce it to all that this is the God of Gods. Express reverence for it and pay sacrifices to it. Through which you will please him, and your wishes shall be fulfilled. Because, probably, this is the one God you have not served yet, who is the one of the Gods that can help you in your need. – **The King performed this**, and he **issued** the treasure. And **gave** lots of gold **to** the master. Who erected the statue, and sculptured it to the likeness of a pagan god. When he cast the image, the image did not reflect his forging: for it did not turn out to be the likeness of a pagan god, but that of a crucifix.]

Although in this episode there is anaphoric reference to the content of the advice (*ezt* ‘this’), what follows is a general verb of action (*megtétet* ‘make perform’). The causative suffix on this verb and on others in the sequence (*el-kiemelteté* ‘make withdraw, have sg issued’, *kezéhez adatá* ‘have it given to sy’s hands’) signals that the King indeed delegated the performance of these actions to others. Yet, this is backgrounded information: the action sequence is attributed to the King. It is evident that speech acts do not have an existence on their own as building blocks of events in the Érsekújvári variant. Also, choosing a grammaticized causative suffix is a more compressed form of event integration than giving prominence to speech acts and constructing events from interactions.

Transition clauses expressing perceptive acknowledgement are frequent in the Érsekújvári variant, but their function is primarily to signal turn-taking in dialogues.

- (21) Katerina hogy ezt hallá, / ennek imily okát adá: [...] (ÉrsK. 459b/20–22)
[As Catherine heard this, / she gave the following the reason for this: ...]

3.5. Compression and elaboration phenomena in clause linkage. Written and oral features

The frequent re-mentioning of characters has been noted (in section 3.3.) as a technique in implementing character foregrounding in the DebrK. version. Foregrounding characters’

interactions acts towards elaboration in clause linkage, since interactions are always tied in with coding the characters (more or less explicitly), which results in clause-equal linguistic forms. It is important to note here that in Late Old Hungarian (as well as in Modern Hungarian), the degree of explicit expression of the subject can be: a) full noun (the most explicit and semantically the most elaborated), b) pronoun, c) zero + verbal inflection (the least explicit and semantically the least elaborated).

Thus, we can contrast the different ways in which the characters are coded linguistically. More or less explicit referent coding (either pronominal or yet more explicit) versus the least explicit coding (by verbal suffix) are studied in the three excerpts. The relative proportion of the more and the least explicit coding is different in the three excerpts. In the ÉrdyK., the proportions are the following. Catherine: 26 more or less vs. 15 least elaborated forms, King Costus: 10 vs. 5; Alphorabius: 6 vs. 1; Lady Queen: 3 vs. 0; old hermit: 6 vs. 0.

In the DebrK., the average number of how many times each character is coded in the discourse (Catherine: 91, King Costus: 62, Alphorabius: 17, Lady Queen: 10, old hermit: 29) is higher than in the ÉrdyK. (Catherine: 41, King Costus: 15, Alphorabius: 7, Lady Queen: 3, old hermit: 6). Also, apart from Catherine the other characters also get more prominence than in the ÉrdyK. The proportion of more or less vs. least explicit referent coding is: Catherine: 57 vs. 34, King Costus: 40 vs. 22; Alphorabius: 16 vs. 1; Lady Queen: 9 vs. 1; old hermit: 26 vs. 3.

The frequent re-coding of referents may seem aimless in the DebrK., but it has a function. It is attested that the author breaks up lengthy monologues into parts (e.g. the hermit telling Catherine about Jesus for the first time, 502/7–504/5; King Costus making his testament to Catherine, 511/11–512/21; "Mondá tovább ez pusztában lakozandó Katerinának" [The forest-dweller went on to say to Catherine]). It seems to be the intention of the author to ensure that his audience keeps track of the characters.

As I suggested above (in section 2.2.), the DebrK. author intended to turn a translated text into a sermon suitable for oral performance. However, he did not manage to have the characters speak spontaneously. The only source of oral phrases in the text is the narrator (*No immáron/No azért* 'Well then/Well now').

The author of the Érsekújvári verse legend uses reciting methods which might remind us of folk tales. As opposed to the DebrK., the oral features of this text do not only come from the preacher addressing his audience. Instead, this version presents folk tale parallelisms, reminiscent of naïve storytelling:

- (22) hogy ő nekünk **azt meglelné**, / **és meglelvén** megizenné... (450a/9–11)
[so that he would **find it out** for us, / **and having found out**, would let us know ...]
- (23) Ezt hogy látá Katerina, / hogy szerencse vele vína, / **atyja szavát megemlité**, / **tanácsát el nem feledé**. (457b/12–15)
[Catherine, seeing this, / that Fortune challenged her, / **remembered her father's words**, / **did not forget his advice**.]

Sources of parallelism can be both the verse rhythm and the oral features of the text:

- (24) Ez dolog hogy megláttaték, / rajta az nép csodálkodék. / Félelem őket megijeszté, / nagy bánat megkörnyékezé. / Elámula az királság, / megrémüle

mind az ország, / és valaki ez képhez mégyen, / Senki nem tudja, mi légyen.
(452a/33–36–b/6)

[When this had been seen, / the people were puzzled. / Fear made them afraid,
/ great sorrow fell upon them. / The kingdom was in awe, / the whole country
got frightened, / and whoever went up to the idol, / no one knew what it was.]

We find the fairy-tale motif of a character in need of help promising good in return for a good deed (*Jó tett helyébe jót várj*):

- (25) és százannyi jót véssz mitülünk, / mennyé munkát vallasz értünk. (450b/31–34)

[and you will receive a hundred times more good from us / than how much
inconvenience you suffer for us.]

- (26) Kiben nekem nagy jót tesztek, / Kiért tülem sok jót vesztek. (455a/15–17)

[By which you (plural) do much good to me, / for which you (plural) will get
much good from me.]

In contrast to the ‘second-hand’ orality of the DebrK. excerpt, everyday phrases are also present in the characters’ speech in the ÉrsK., especially in the way they address each other. Also, while Catherine is addressed only six times in the ÉrdyK., and 34 times in the DebrK., she is addressed 78 times in the ÉrsK. The difference is most remarkable in her dialogue with the hermit.

Frequency of more or less explicit referent coding versus least explicit forms is the following in the ÉrsK. excerpt. Catherine: 89 vs. 55, King Costus: 45 vs. 78, Alphorabius: 22 vs. 25, Lady Queen: 6 vs. 2, old hermit: 21 vs. 3. It can be seen from these numbers that the King and Alphorabius remain implicitly coded (i.e., coded by verbal suffixation) much more frequently than in the DebrK. One reason for this lies in the fact that interactions are not used as building blocks of events in narration (which would necessitate more explicit referent coding). In other words, event integration is more condense, which is in turn reflected in clause linkage. The sum of how many times each character is coded in the discourse (Catherine: 144, King Costus: 123, Alphorabius: 47, Lady Queen: 8, old hermit: 24) shows that King Costus is the most prominent character besides Catherine in this version.

In addition, the fictional characters seem even more life-like, because the narrator attributes gestures to them when letting them speak (*rátekinte* ‘looked at her’; *mosolyula* ‘smiled’; *szent fiához hajla, mondván* ‘leaned to her holy son, saying’). This is a stylistic tool entirely absent from Pelbartus and the Hungarian prose versions.

- (27) Az remete **rátekinte**, / és neki ily szót felele: / – Mind így légyen, amint mondom.
/ Emmi te téssz, / mégsem te dolgoz, / mert ez illet férfiat. (460a 9–14)

[The hermit **looked at her**, / and answered to her with these words: / ‘All may
well be as you say. / What you are doing / is nevertheless not you duty, / for it
is a man’s duty.’]

Furthermore, dialogues acquire credibility and originality as the characters reflect verbally on what the other has to say. This is especially true in Catherine and the hermit’s encounters:

- (28) Azért, jó fiam, így értsed, / szómat eszedben így végyed (459a/27–28)
[Therefore, good child, understand it thus, / mark my words in this way...]
- (29) Jó leányom, azt is kérdéd, / és bizony, jó megértened, / mely az Isten, kit imádok... (459b/3–6)
[Good daughter, you asked also, / which you do well to understand, indeed, / which God I worship...]
- (30) Ne gondolj semmit mindebből, jó Atyám... (460b/21–23)
[Do not think wrong of this, good Father]
- (31) Néked ím egy új hírt mondok, / kivel neked nagy sok jót adok. / Mert hiszem, fiam, nem hallottad, / vagy írásban nem olvastad, / hogy ... (461a/22–26)
[Now, I bring you news, / by which I give you great good. / For, I believe, child, that you have not yet heard / or read in any writings / that...]

3.6. Event integration in prose and verse

The three surviving versions of Saint Catherine's legend display a genre difference, of which the most important aspect here is the set of rhythmical constraints placed on the forms of clause integration in verse. The rhythm of narration in the DebrK. turns out to be quite monotonous with the constant re-mentioning of characters, and the various rephrasings. By contrast, the verse rhythm in the ÉrsK. plays a major role in shaping clause integration and, eventually, event integration.

The first obvious difference is in the frequency of main clause phoric elements. A 'phoric element' (H. *utalószó*) is a grammatical element used in Hungarian subordinating clause combining besides conjunctions (Haader 2000a: 477–479). A brief account of its origin is due here. Parallel with the development of the nominal demonstrative pronoun into a definite article (mentioned in section 3.3.), the Old Hungarian period saw the emergence of a distinct syntactic device in clause combining. Similarly to the case of the definite article, it is the far-pointing *az* nominal demonstrative that came to acquire a special textual-syntactic function.

Azt	szeretném,	ha	újra	gyerek	lehetnék.
PHOR.PR.('that-ACC.')	like-cond.-1sg.DEF.	if	again	child	I-could-be
'I would like to be a child again.'					

Traditionally, grammarians locate the phoric element in the main clause of a subordinating complex clause. It marks the constituent position of the subordinate clause, inside the main clause, i.e. it takes object, adverb, subject, etc. suffixes. It is co-referent with the subordinate clause.

The sum of main-clause 'phoric elements' in the three excerpts (ÉrdyK: 15, DebrK: 49, ÉrsK: 126) exceeds the 1: 3: 5 proportion of the texts' lengths. The high number of 'phoric elements' in the ÉrsK. was noted by Dömötör (2001: 362–364). In the ÉrsK. excerpt, 'phoric elements' are placed in stressed syllables in order to conform to the verse rhythm (and perhaps to get the necessary number of syllables). There is a one-clause-one-rhythmical-unit correspondence, with the main clause preceding its subordinate clause most of the time.

- (32) *Az remete ottan így tön*, / hogy egy írott táblát felvén, / és ezt Katerinának adá,
/ és beszéddel ezt monda: (ÉrsK.: 462b/18–22)
[Then, the hermit **did this**, / that he took a painted board, / and this he gave to
Catherine, / and in speech he said this:]

A related phenomenon is the occurrence of verbal predicate subordinating complex clauses (this, in fact, is considered to be a semantic relation rather than a grammatical one, cf. Hadrovics 1969, Haader 2000b: 488). The above example is a typical main clause occurring at thematic junctures, opening new sequences of events. It is in fact a variant of the main clause heading the thematic paragraph discussed towards the end of section 3.4. As we have seen above, the syntactic coding of event integration in the ÉrsK. is different from those in both the ÉrdyK. and the DebrK. versions. At major thematic boundaries, the break in temporal coherence is signalled, but temporal relations are not of the syntactically coded type cataphorically relevant inside the clause complex. Rather, they are established textually, by anaphorical adverbials in the main clause (*ezután ~ ennek utána*, *ottan* 'after this, then').

- (33) *Ennek utána imígy lön*: / Costus tanácsot tön, / az leányt kinek nevezné, /
hogy méltó névvel illetné, [...] (ÉrsK. 454a/32–37)
[After this, this is what happened: / Costus held a consultation / about what
name he should give to his daughter, / in order to name her appropriately...]
- (34) *Ezután az király így tön*, / hogy tanácsival egybe lön, / az mestert odahívátván,
/ és akaratját nyilván megmonda. / És ötet csak azon kéré, / hogy őnéki azt
meglelné, / ha [...] (ÉrsK. 451a/19–25)
[After this, the King did this: / he gathered with his advisors, / summoning the
wise master, / and expressing his wish. / And he asked him only / to find out for
him / whether ...]

Quite naturally, this latter kind of textually coded temporal (dis)continuity occurs in the two prose versions as well (ÉrdyK.: *Azonközben* 'meanwhile', *Annak utána* 'after that'; DebrK.: *Ezenközben* 'meanwhile', *Ennek utána* 'after this').

The last syntactic phenomenon that I would like to discuss in this paper is the influence of verse rhythm on word order in the ÉrsK. excerpt. Modern Hungarian word order reflects the functional sentence perspective, which went through a considerable amount of change since the Old Hungarian linguistic period. Today, the focus position is a uniquely important part of the clause, preceding the verb. The focus element is considered to project its own syntactic phrase by certain linguistic schools.

In the excerpt analysed below, it can be observed that the one rhythmical unit-one clause tendency influences the position of the conjunctions and particles, too. In many cases, content words head the clauses, conjunctions and particles being shifted into second position (*ha* 'if', *hogy* 'that', *menyé* 'as soon as', etc.). This is a stylistically marked realization of word order in Hungarian clause complexes.

- (35) *Alphorabius ezt hogy hallá*, / ég forgását jól meglátná. / **Az királyra is** tekinte,
/ természeti mit követne. / **Az asszonyt is** kihívátá, / **természetit** jól meglátná.
/ **Indítá** sok cseleködést, / és e dologról mesterkődést. / Bölcsességének miatta
ő lettek napjára juta, / és a csillagot jól meglátá, / *ki* azkoron uralkodott. /

Mindezekbe kétség nélkül / ím **így** lelé vétök nélkül / **azt**, *hogy ég* forgása **azt** tartja, / **természetök** *is* mutatja, / *hogy* lehetne magzat tőlek, / *mert* nincs vétök őfelőlek. / *Azért* az mester felkele, / **az királynak így** felele: [...]
 [Alphorabius+ **this**+ when+ heard, / the sky's movements he thoroughly observed. / **The King**, *too*, he looked at, / (to see) what his nature is influenced by. / **The Lady Queen**, *too*, he summoned, / **for her nature** to be observed. / He **started** several practices, / *and* methods to solve this problem. / With his knowledge, he figured out the dates of their births, / *and* observed the stars / which dominated at those times. / From all this, without doubt, / he thus found out clearly / **'that'** that the sky's movements shows]

4. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to illustrate how the syntactic coding of three main coherence strands in the 'same' narrative (in our case study, the legend) is shaped by the preaching situation in which it is retold. The exact differences in coding temporal, referent and action continuity were pointed out. It was demonstrated that the differences are indeed closely reflected in the chosen grammatical forms of clause integration. The results of the analysis shed light on the factors motivating the two opposing forces of elaboration and compression in clause linkage, which were already present in the Late Old Hungarian period. These were shown to correlate with written and oral text features, and genre differences of prose and verse. As a conclusion, a summary of the main findings is presented below.

4.1. The relationship of the three surviving Hungarian legend variants to their common Latin source text varies in accordance with the aims of the authors. The communicative setting indeed shaped the narrators' choices of event integration, which is reflected in their preferred ways of grammatical expression.

The Érdy version, attached as an appendix to a lengthy argumentation, is presented in a style so simple and condense that it even contains omissions of story details taken from Pelbartus. There is a contrast between the level of effort needed for processing the two text types, i.e. the argumentation and the narrative. The ease with which a narrative is understood makes it possible for the Érdy author to subvert the era's general tendency to opt for high levels of grammatical elaboration, with his grammatical choices often only loosely reflecting the corresponding forms of the Latin source text. By contrast, the Debreceni author unfolded his tale striving to focus the audience's attention on the characters, and teach and instruct them in due manner. The clumsiness of this excerpt comes from the artificial conversion from written Latin text to oral Hungarian, the story coming to a halt again and again due to the preacher's interpolations. Since it is the narrative that serves as a frame in this variant, there are plenty of opportunities for the preacher-narrator to elaborate on it, with the intention of keeping the attention of the audience awake.

The Érsekújvári variant's uniqueness lies in its verse form and those yet unidentified sources which must exist in various vernacular languages. The common Latin source had a much less immediate influence on this version, and virtually no grammatical choices can be traced back directly to it, neither can it be simply compared to the prose versions. The verse form constrains and shapes grammatical expression into a lively rhythm, thus pushing grammatical coding towards elaboration, while making use of parallelism.

4.2. The discourse potential of time adverbial clauses as coherence bridges at thematic boundaries already existed in the Late Old Hungarian linguistic period. This type of clause was used abundantly by all three authors in coding temporal (dis)continuity in their narratives. The most frequently used conjunction, *mikoron* ('when'), was shown to be alternating with *hogy* ('as') in the Debreceni excerpt, and with *menyé* ('as soon as') in the Érsekújvári version.

4.3. Differences in the ways of coding referent (dis)continuity were shown to be shaped by the demands of the preacher's communicative goals. The point of view of the narration is firmly held by the narrator in all three texts. However, the characters as main discourse referents are mentioned most often and coded in a rather explicit way in clauses in which speech acts are used as building blocks of events by the Debreceni author.

4.4. Ways of coding action continuity in the narration were analysed along the compression-elaboration continuum, which ranks clause linkage realizations reflecting forms of event integration. The type of clause used in the transition between the narrated actions and utterances shows the concise vs. loose nature of event integration. It codes a phase of perceptive acknowledgement in the narration, which may exist as the building block of an event. Its frequent occurrence signals a high degree of character foregrounding, which is attested in the Debreceni excerpt. However, it may also be used merely to code turn-takes in dialogues quoted by the narrator, as does the Érsekújvári author.

Attributing speech acts (i.e. orders, thanks, enquiries) to characters in a story seems to be useful in constructing sequences of events, too. This strategy, applied by the Debreceni author, is a more elaborate way of event integration than the rather compressed expression we find in the Érsekújvári variant. There, the causative verbal suffix codes the act of giving orders, in which case no separate phases of character interaction are elaborated on, but the action is rather attributed to the one giving the order.

4.5. Considering the written and oral features of the three excerpts, the key concept proved to be character foregrounding. The forms and degrees of giving prominence to the protagonist (Catherine) are mirrored in the explicitness of coding her linguistically. The proportion of more or less explicit vs. the least explicit referent coding shows the relative prominence the authors had given to characters other than Catherine. Also, least explicit referent coding is in proportion higher if 1) there is no need for keeping track of the characters due to the scarcity of preacher's interpolations; 2) if characters' interactions are rather condensely narrated.

The authors' use of oral phrases is not characteristic of the Érdy narrator. The Debreceni author uses a few oral phrases in his role as narrator, and some more as preacher. However, his orality lacks the spontaneity that the Érsekújvári author manages to convey in his dialogues. First-hand oral phrases are quoted as the words of the characters themselves. This is most obvious in the forms (and frequency) of their addressing each other. While the Debreceni version has visible remnants of a written original, the Érsekújvári excerpt abounds in parallelisms, thus reminiscent of ancient oral storytelling. One source of these parallelisms is verse rhythm.

4.6. In the last section, I investigated the special choices made by the Érsekújvári author when formulating his (or her) verse legend. There is in fact a significant rise in the number of

'phoric pronouns' used in the grammatical integration of subordinate clauses with their main clauses. This can be traced back to the rhythmical constraints of the genre. Another tendency motivated by verse rhythm is the one clause-one rhythmical unit correlation.

The dominant author figure of the era was the translator-compiler-author educated in one of the religious orders in Hungary. These preachers helped to shape the linguistic norms of the various text types prevalent in the Middle Ages before linguistic standardization took place. In this study, I hope to have provided reliable results for future analyses of the history of clause linkage and text types.

Abbreviations and text editions

The quoted material was taken from the modern critical editions of the DebrK. and the Pelbartus-volume, and from editions in preparation of the ÉrdyK. and the ÉrsK. The original spelling, however, has been converted into Modern Hungarian spelling conventions and graphemic usage for the sake of easier reading. Each Hungarian manuscript has a 19th century edition, worth including in the list below.

DebrK. = *Debreceni Kódex 1519. A nyelvemlék hasonmása és betűhű átirata bevezetéssel és jegyzetekkel*. Budapest: Argumentum Kiadó – Magyar Nyelvtudományi Társaság, 1997.

Debreceni Kódex (1519). Közzéteszi Volf György. Nyelvemléktár 11. Budapest. 1882.

ÉrdyK. = *ÉrdyK. (1526–1527)*. Közzéteszi Volf György. Nyelvemléktár 4–5. Budapest. 1876.

ÉrsK. = *Érsekújvári Kódex (1529–31)*. Közzéteszi Volf György. Nyelvemléktár 9–10. Budapest. 1888.

Alexandriai Szent Katalin verses legendája. In: Madas Edit (ed.) 1991. Szöveggyűjtemény a régi magyar irodalom történetéhez. Középkor. (1000–1530) [A reader of early Hungarian literature. Middle Ages, 1000–1530] Available at: http://sermones.elte.hu/szovegkiadasok/magyarul/madasszgy/515_539_Elbeszelo_kolteszet.htm

Pelbartus de Themeswar: *Sermones Pomerii de sanctis II. [Pars aestivalis]*. Augsburg 1502. RMK III. 104. The modern critical edition is available at: <http://emc.elte.hu/pelbart/>

References

- Bakonyi, Dóra 2008. A tagmondatok kapcsolódási formái egy ómagyar kori szövegtípusban: a legendában [Clause combining in an old Hungarian text type: the legend]. In: Tátrai Szilárd – Tolcsvai Nagy Gábor (eds.): *Szöveg, szövegtípus, nyelvtan* [Text, text type, and grammar]. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó. 279–290.
- Balázs, Judit 1995. A mondat szerkezete. [Sentence macrostructure] In: Rácz, Endre (ed.): *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana* [A historical grammar of Hungarian]. Vol. II/2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 43–120.
- Beaugrande, Robert-Alain de – Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1981. *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Berrár, Jolán 1957. *Magyar történeti mondattan* [A historical syntax of Hungarian]. Tankönyvkiadó: Budapest.
- Berrár, Jolán 1960. *A magyar hasonlító mondatok története a XVI. század közepéig* [The history of comparative complex sentences from the beginnings to the mid-16th century]. Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 23. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Dömötör, Adrienne 1995. Az alárendelő mondatok: A jelzői mondatok [Subordinating complex clauses: Attributive subordination]. In: Rácz, Endre (ed.): *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana* [A historical grammar of Hungarian]. Vol. II/2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 666–693.
- Dömötör, Adrienne 2001. Tendencies in the development of late old Hungarian and early middle Hungarian main clauses of reported speech. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 48 (4): 337–369.

- Dömötör, Adrienne 2003. Structural synonymy and formal variants: Relative clauses and their parallels in six early Hungarian translations of the Bible. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 50 (3–4): 341–369.
- Gallasy, Magdolna 1992. A névelők (A palatális változat. A szövegtéma kiemelése) [Articles. (The palatal variant. The highlighting of discourse topics)]. In: Benkő, Loránd (ed.): *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana* [A historical grammar of Hungarian]. Vol. II/1. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 749.
- Gallasy, Magdolna 2003. Szövegtörténet. [The history of text types] In: Kiss, Jenő – Pusztai, Ferenc (eds.): *Magyar nyelvtörténet*. [The history of Hungarian]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó. 561–576.
- Givón, Talmy 1990. *Syntax. A Functional-typological introduction*. Vol. II. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Gugán, Katalin 2002. Syntactic synonymy: A case study. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 49 (1): 23–49.
- Haader, Lea 1993. „eez myt mondaz myes twgyok” [„We also know what you are saying”]. *Névtani Értésítő* 15: 134–137.
- Haader, Lea 1995. Az alárendelő mondatok: Az alanyi, állítmányi, tárgyi és határozói mondatok [Subordinating complex clauses: Subject, predicate, object, and adverbial subordination]. In: Rác Endre (ed.): *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana* [A historical grammar of Hungarian]. Vol. II /2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 506–664.
- Haader, Lea 2000a. Az alárendelő összetett mondatok. Általános kérdések [Subordinating complex clauses. General issues]. In: Keszler Borbála (ed.): *Magyar grammatika* [Hungarian grammar]. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó. 477–487.
- Haader, Lea 2000b. Az alárendelő összetett mondatok. Nem bővítményt kifejtő mellékmondat. Az állítmányi mellékmondat [Subordinating complex clauses. Predicate subordination]. In: Keszler, Borbála (ed.): *Magyar grammatika* [Hungarian grammar]. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó. 488–489.
- Haader, Lea 2003. Az ómagyar kor. Mondattörténet. Az összetett mondat [Old Hungarian period. Syntax. Complex sentences]. In: Kiss Jenő – Pusztai Ferenc (eds.): *Magyar nyelvtörténet* [The history of Hungarian]. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó. 500–560.
- Hadrovics, László 1969. *A funkcionális magyar mondattan alapjai* [Foundations of a functional syntax of Hungarian]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Jürgens, Frank 1999. *Auf dem Weg zu einer pragmatischen Syntax. Eine vergleichende Fallstudie zu Präferenzen in gesprochen und geschrieben realisierten Textsorten* [Towards a pragmatic syntax. A comparative case study of preferences in oral and written text types]. Reihe Germanische Linguistik 207. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Károly, Sándor 1956. *Igenévrendszerünk a kódexirodalom első szakában* [The system of gerunds, infinitives, participles and verbal nouns in old Hungarian]. Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 10. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Károly, Sándor 1995. Kései ómagyar kori emlékek szöveggrammatikája [Late old Hungarian discourse grammar]. In: Rác Endre (ed.): *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana* [History of the Hungarian language]. Vol. II/2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 761–834.
- Klemm, Antal 1928. *Magyar történeti mondattan* [A historical syntax of Hungarian]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Lehmann, Christian 1988. Towards a typology of clause linkage. In: Haiman, John – Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.): *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Typological Studies in Language 18. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 181–225.
- Lehmann, Christian 2007. Information structure and grammaticalization. In: López-Couso, María José – Seoane Posse, Elena (eds.): *New reflections on grammaticalization* 3. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Available at: http://www.uni-erfurt.de/sprachwissenschaft/personal/lehmann/CL_Publ/information_structure.pdf
- M. Nagy, Ilona 2003. A magyar kolostori irodalom koordinált szópárjainak hátteréhez [Word-level coordination in old Hungarian religious literature]. In: A. Molnár Ferenc – M. Nagy, Ilona (eds.): *Tanulmányok a magyar egyházi nyelv története köréből* [Papers on old Hungarian religious language]. Debrecen. 169–183.
- Matthiessen, Christian – Thompson, Sandra A. 1988. The structure of discourse and ‘subordination’. In: Haiman, John – Thompson, Sandra A. (eds.): *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Typological Studies in Language 18. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 275–329.
- Molnár, Ilona 1977. *A tartalmatlan hogy kötőszós összetett mondatok típusai szemantikai szempontból* [Types of complex sentences with the dummy subordinator *hogy* ‘that’ from a semantic perspective]. Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 94. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Papp, Zsuzsanna 1995. A mellérendelő összetett mondatok [Clause-level coordination]. In: Rác Endre (ed.): *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana* [History of the Hungarian language]. Vol. II/2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 719–757.

- Rajhona, Flóra 2003. Alexandriai Szent Katalin legendája Temesvári Pelbárt feldolgozásában. Szakdolgozat [The legend of Saint Catherine of Alexandria in Pelbartus de Temeswar's sermons. MA Thesis]. Budapest: ELTE BTK Magyar nyelv és irodalom szak.
- Rajhona, Flóra 2004. Alexandriai Szent Katalin legendája Temesvári Pelbárt feldolgozásában [The legend of Saint Catherine of Alexandria in Pelbartus de Temeswar's sermons]. In: Bárczi, Ildikó (ed.): *Plaustrum seculi. Tanulmányok régi prédikációirodalmunkról* [Papers on old Hungarian sermon literature]. Budapest: Eötvös Kiadó. 6–32.
- Simonyi, Zsigmond 1881. *A magyar kötőszók, egyuttal az összetett mondat elmélete. I. A mellérendelő kötőszók* [Hungarian conjunctions and the theory of complex clauses. 1. Coordinating conjunctions]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Simonyi Zsigmond 1882. *Az alárendelő kötőszók első fele: A főnévi mellékmondatok kötőszavai. A hogy és –e kötőszók* [Subordinating conjunctions, part 1: Conjunctions of nominal clauses: *hogy* 'that' and *-e*]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Simonyi, Zsigmond 1883. *Az alárendelő kötőszók második fele: A határozó mondatok kötőszavai* [Subordinating conjunctions, part 2: Conjunctions of adverbial clauses]. Budapest: Magyar Tudományos Akadémia.
- Wacha, Balázs 1995a. A mondat aktuális tagolása [The information structure of the sentence]. In: Rácz, Endre (ed.): *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana* [A historical grammar of Hungarian]. Vol. II/2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 121–154.
- Wacha, Balázs 1995b. A mondat szórendje [Word order]. In: Rácz Endre (ed.): *A magyar nyelv történeti nyelvtana* [A historical grammar of Hungarian]. Vol. II/2. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. 125–209.