

Dichotomies in Secondary Predication: A view from complex predicates in Hungarian

Balázs Surányi^{1,2} and Veronika Hegedüs¹

¹RIL Hungarian Academy of Sciences, ²Pázmány Péter Catholic University

1. Objective and proposals This paper investigates the empirically largely uncharted territory of resultative and depictive secondary predication in Hungarian, bringing evidence from this language to bear on some of the basic issues in the cross-linguistic syntax of secondary predication. We argue for the following claims: (i) Despite the alleged ‘non-configurational’ character of the verb phrase (É. Kiss 1994, 2003), resultative secondary predicates (RSP) and depictive secondary predicates (DSP) are distinguished structurally (pace Cormack and Smith 1999, Rothstein 2001, 2003, 2004), as reflected in terms of complex predicate formation. RSPs form a complex predicate with the verb in overt syntax, which provides vivid support in favor of complex predicate accounts of RSPs (though RSP complex predicates are not base structure constituents, unlike for Neeleman 1994, Winkler 1997, etc). (ii) Weak resultatives (in the sense of Washio 1997) do not differ from strong resultatives in terms of uniformly being adjuncts (contra Iwata 2006). The principal division is not, in fact, between strong vs. weak resultatives, but between those that form a complex predicate together with the verb and those that do not. (iii) Most, but not all, DSPs are adjuncts and cannot form a complex predicate with the verb. Although the position of depictives is syntactically flexible, despite the general freedom of post-verbal word order, the positions available to Subject-oriented depictives can be shown to be higher than those that can be occupied by Object-oriented DSPs.

2. Resultatives and complex predicate formation The immediately pre-verbal position in Hungarian is occupied in narrow focus sentences by the narrow focus element, and in broad focus sentences by some member of the class of syntactically phrasal elements referred to as Verbal Modifiers (VM), which a.o. include separable verbal particles, bare NP arguments, infinitival complement VPs, and directional PPs. VMs all share the semantic property of being of a predicative type (Komlosy 1994, É. Kiss 2006). The immediately pre-verbal slot they occupy is a syntactically derived (functional specifier) position (É. Kiss 1994, 2002) that has been claimed to be associated with a special mode of composition (Farkas and de Swart 2003), combining the verbal predicate and the VM into a single complex predicate. In neutral sentences without a verbal particle, RSPs must occupy the VM slot (1), which we take to be evidence that they form a complex predicate together with the verb. Independent evidence for the latter conclusion comes, for instance, from *again*-modification and discourse anaphora. First, RSPs in the VM position cannot be selectively modified by the adverbial *again*, which therefore cannot give rise to a restitutive reading. Second, NPs inside RSPs in the VM position do not introduce discourse referents that can be picked up by anaphoric relative pronouns (2a). As we show, weak resultatives do not differ in these respects from strong resultatives, as long as they occupy the VM position.

Resultatives (whether strong or weak) that do not raise to the VM position but remain post-verbal do not form a complex predicate with the verb. Evidence that post-verbal Verbal Modifiers are not part of the verbal complex predicate in general comes, for example, from the distribution of bare singular NPs. These Verbal Modifiers cannot be post-verbal but must occupy the VM position (in neutral sentences), because they can only be licensed as part of a complex predicate (Farkas and de Swart 2003). As expected, the NPs that make post-verbal RSPs can be picked up by discourse anaphoric relative pronouns (2b). RSPs can and must remain post-verbal if the VM slot is occupied by a resultative verbal particle, forming a complex predicate together with the verb, see (2b). We propose to analyze post-verbal *apparent* RSPs as a base structure appositive adjuncts to the resultative verbal particle (whose case suffix is a function of the syntactic environment it is found in, as proposed by Matushansky 2012), which acts as the RSP that gets raised to the VM position from its Small Clause (=ResP) predicate position (3). In this structure, although the particle RSP undergoes complex predicate formation in VM and is unavailable to selective modification by *again*, the latter can target the resultative appositive adjunct, which is not part of the complex predicate formed together with

the verb (4). Accordingly, a restitutive reading is accessible in (5a), where the resultative adjective is an adjunct. If the same adjunct functions as the RSP itself and raises to the VM slot, as in (5b), only the repetitive reading remains available. That such post-verbal resultative phrases are adjuncts is supported by the fact that they do not permit *wh*-subextraction from them (6a) (cf. (6b)), whereas ordinary RSPs do.

3. Depictives DSPs do not raise to the VM position, unlike RSPs, suggesting that they do not form a complex predicate with the verb. We argue (based on the behavior of DSPs w.r.t. other VM elements and sentential negation) that DSPs that do appear immediately pre-verbally are not VMs, but either function as a narrow focus of the sentence, or as an adjunct preceding an unfilled VM position. Regarding phrase structural status, the fact that DSPs disallow subextraction whether they are pre-verbal or post-verbal supports their structural analysis as adjuncts. We argue that this is the reason why they cannot form a complex predicate with the verb by raising to the VM slot: adjuncts are generally unable to do so. That the fact that DSPs cannot compose a complex predicate in the VM position with the verb is due to their adjunct status is corroborated by evidence from secondary predicates that behave like complements (or selected RSPs) in being obligatory (7), yet attest to being DSPs in bearing the superessive suffix that is typical of DSPs and unavailable in RSPs. These complement DSPs, in contrast to adjunct DSPs, not only can but must appear in the VM position, where they enter complex predicate formation.

According to evidence from *do so*-replacement and (partial) verb phrase fronting, only Subject-oriented depictives can appear at the level of *vP* and above, while Object-oriented DSPs are confined to the VP. First, the constituent replaced by (the pronoun *so*) in *do so*, which we take to be VP following Hallmann (2004), needs to include Object-oriented depictives, but not Subject-oriented ones (8). Second, Object-oriented DSPs need to be included in partial verb phrase fronting, while Subject-oriented DSPs may be left behind, as will be amply exemplified. In both of these regards Object-oriented DSPs behave similarly to adjuncts to the trace copy of RSP illustrated in (5a) and (6), since both of these predicative adjunct phrases are located inside VP. Third, pre-verbal DSPs preceding the VM position and hence being situated above at least *vP*, can only be interpreted as Subject-oriented but not as Object-oriented. (As is generally the case, the subject itself may be postposed and may optionally appear the post-verbal field.)

- (1) a. **János* *táncolta* *rongyosra* *a cipőjét*
John danced ragged-SUP the shoe.his-ACC
- b. *János* *rongyosra* *táncolta* *a cipőjét*
- (2) a. #*A hörcsög* *darabokra* *rágta* *a dobozát,...*
the hamster pieces-SUBL chewed the box.his-ACC
- b. *A hörcsög* *szét* *rágta* *a dobozát* *darabokra,...*
the hamster apart chewed the box.his-ACC pieces-SUBL
- ...*amiket* *aztán* *János* *össze* *ragasztott.*
which-PL-ACC then John together glued
- (3) [_{PredP} in_i [_{Pred'} [_{Pred} paint] ... V [_{ResP} [_{NP} the wall] [_{Res'} Res [_{AP} [_{AP} t_i] [_{AP} white]]]]]]]]
- (4) [_{PredP} in_i [_{Pred'} [_{Pred} paint] ... V [_{ResP} [_{NP} the wall] [_{Res'} Res [_{AP} again [_{AP} [_{AP} t_i] [_{AP} white]]]]]]]]]]
- (5) a. *Be festem* *újra* *fehérre* *a falat* (repetitive / restitutive)
In paint-1SG again white-SUBL the wall
- b. *Fehérre festem* *újra* *a falat* (repetitive / #restitutive)
- (6) a. *_[FocP] *Kibez formáltad* [_{PredP} *át* [*Jánost* *basonlóvá*]]]?
who-to formed-2SG through John-ACC similar-TRANSL
- b. [_{PredP} *Át* *formáltad* [*Jánost* [_{AP} *bozzád* *basonlóvá*]]].
Through formed-2SG John-ACC you.to similar-TRANSL

(7)	<i>Péter</i>	*(szárazon)	<i>bagyta</i>	<i>a törölközőt.</i>	
	Peter	dry-SUP	left	the towel-ACC	
(8)	<i>Péter</i>	<i>kikísérte</i>	<i>a reptérre</i>	<i>Marit</i>	<i>részegen,</i>
	Peter	walked	the airport-to	Mary-ACC	drunk-SUP
	<i>és</i>	<i>János is</i>	<i>így tett</i>	<i>józanon.</i>	
	and	John also	so did	sober-SUP	(^{OK} Subj / *Obj)

References

- Cormack, Annabel & Neil Smith. 1999. Why are depictives different from resultatives? *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 11: 251-286.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 1994. Sentence structure and word order. In Ferenc Kiefer & Katalin É. Kiss (eds.) *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian. (Syntax and Semantics 27)*. San Diego/New York: Academic Press, 1-90.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2003. Argument scrambling, focus movement and topic movement in Hungarian. In: Simin Karimi (ed.) *Word Order and Scrambling*. London: Blackwell, 22-43.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2006. The function and the syntax of the verbal particle. In Event structure and the left periphery, edited by Katalin É. Kiss, *Studies on Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Springer, 17–56.
- Farkas, Donka & Henriette de Swart. 2003. *The Semantics of Incorporation. From Argument Structure to Discourse Transparency*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Hallman, Peter (2006). Constituency and Agency in VP. In Benjamin Schmeiser *et al* (eds) *Proceedings of WCCFL 23*, Cascadilla Press, 304-317.
- Iwata, Seizi. 2006. Argument resultatives and adjunct resultatives in a lexical constructional account: the case of resultatives with adjectival result phrases. *Language Sciences* 28: 449-496
- Komlósy, András. 1994. Complements and adjuncts. In Ferenc Kiefer & Katalin É. Kiss (eds.) *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian. (Syntax and Semantics 27)*. San Diego/New York: Academic Press, 91-178.
- Matushansky, Ora. 2012. On the Internal Structure of Case in Finno-Ugric Small Clauses. *Finno-Ugric Languages and Linguistics* 1(1-2): 3-43. <http://full.btk.ppke.hu>
- Neeleman, Ad. 1994. *Complex Predicates*. PhD dissertation, Utrecht University.
- Rothstein, Susan. 2001. Secondary Predicates and Their Subjects. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rothstein, Susan. 2003. Secondary Predication and Aspectual Structure. In E. Lang, C. Fabricius-Hansen and C. Maienborn (eds.) *Handbook on Adjuncts*. Berlin: Mouton, 553-590.
- Rothstein, Susan 2004. *Structuring Events: A Study in the Semantics of Lexical Aspect*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Washio, Ryuichi. 1997. Resultatives, compositionality and language variation. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6: 1-49.
- Winkler, Susanne. 1997. *Focus and Secondary Predication*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.