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1 Introduction

1.1 Naked Ps are true adpositions

Hungarian has two kinds of postpositions: so-called “dressed”/agreeing Ps take morphologically unmarked complements, while so-called “naked”/non-agreeing Ps take oblique complements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>naked P</th>
<th>dressed P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a híd-on át</td>
<td>a híd mellett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the bridge via</td>
<td>the bridge next.to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across the bridge</td>
<td>next to the bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On these two classes, see Marácz (1986, 1989); É. Kiss (1999); Hegedűs (2006); Asbury et al. (2007); Asbury (2008); Surányi (2009b); Dékány (2011); Laczkó and Rákos (2011); Hegedűs (2013).

In this talk, we are interested in the distribution of “naked” Ps only. We assume that naked Ps are also Ps, and involve a complementation structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>postposition</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>case</th>
<th>agreement with pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alul</td>
<td>below</td>
<td>superessive</td>
<td>doesn’t co-occur with a pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belül</td>
<td>inside of</td>
<td>superessive</td>
<td>doesn’t co-occur with a pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felül</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>superessive</td>
<td>doesn’t co-occur with a pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innen</td>
<td>on this side of</td>
<td>superessive</td>
<td>doesn’t co-occur with a pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kívül-re</td>
<td>outside-to, beside-to</td>
<td>superessive</td>
<td>doesn’t co-occur with a pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kívül-ről</td>
<td>outside-from</td>
<td>superessive</td>
<td>doesn’t co-occur with a pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>túl-ra</td>
<td>beyond-to</td>
<td>superessive</td>
<td>doesn’t co-occur with a pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>túl-ről</td>
<td>beyond-from</td>
<td>superessive</td>
<td>doesn’t co-occur with a pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>át</td>
<td>through, across, via</td>
<td>superessive</td>
<td>yes, on the case-marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>együtt</td>
<td>together</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>yes, on the case-marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keresztül</td>
<td>through, across, via</td>
<td>superessive</td>
<td>yes, on the case-marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kívül</td>
<td>outside, beside</td>
<td>superessive</td>
<td>yes, on the case-marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>közel</td>
<td>close to</td>
<td>allative</td>
<td>yes, on the case-marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szembe</td>
<td>opposite.to</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>yes, on the case-marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The research presented here is supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA NK 100804).
1.2 Aims

- show that while the literature makes claims about the class as a whole, there are important, so far unnoticed differences between the word order possibilities of different Ps
- show that there are so far unnoticed correlations between different types of extraction out of the PP
- analyze the observed word orders
- show that there are differences between the word order possibilities of different readings of the same element, too

1.3 Claims

- PPs structure includes positions for Ps denoting place and path, and a functional position \( p \) for prepositions and for particles (for cross-linguistic proposals cf. Van Riemsdijk 1990, Cinque and Rizzi 2010, etc.).

\[
(3) \quad [p_{P} \text{ particle/non-agreeing P } [p_{\text{PathP}} \text{ Path } [p_{\text{PlaceP}} \text{ Place KP } ] ]]
\]

- the elements in \( p \) are the ones with freer word order properties, and they can be separated from their complement (PathP/PlaceP). This derives the differences we observe within the class of adpositions.
- naked Ps with a more free word order involve a PP-internal escape hatch, extraction from PP proceeds through CP\(_{PP}\)

1.4 Roadmap

Section 2: PP structure
Section 3: The literature’s claims regarding naked Ps
Section 4: PP-internal differences: word order
Section 5: Differences in clausal positions
Section 6: Analysis
Section 7: PP-internal differences: complements
Section 8: Extensions
Section 9: Conclusions
2 PP structure

Variation in details, but everybody agrees that there is a PathP above PlaceP.
Morphosyntactic arguments: van Riemsdijk and Huybregts (2002); Pantcheva (2011)
Syntactic arguments: van Riemsdijk (1990); Koopman (2000); Cinque (2010); den Dikken (2010); Svenonius (2010).

(4) PathP
    ├── Path
    │    └── PlaceP
    │         ├── Place
    │         └── DP

p: parallel with v, it introduces the Figure (the PP’s subject) in its specifier

(5) pP
    ├── Figure
    │    └── p PathP/PlaceP

left periphery: what Koopman (2000, 2010); den Dikken (2010) call CP_{Place/Path}, we call it CP_{PP}.

(6) pP
    ├── DP
    │    └── the cat
    │         └── under the mat

(7) CP_{PP}
    └── pP
        └── Figure
            └── p PathP/PlaceP

3 The literature’s claims regarding naked Ps

- Complementation
  - Case-marking of the complement is oblique

    (8) a fal-on át
        the wall-sup through
        through the wall

  - Can be used without an overt complement

    (9) János át-jétt/ment.
        John through-come.past.3sg/go.past.3sg
        John came/went over.
• Agreement
  – No agreement with the complement
    (10) rajt-am át-*(am)
         sup-1sg through-1sg
         through me
  – No demonstrative concord
    (11) *ez-en át a fal-on át
         this-sup through the fall-sup through
         through this wall

• Word order effects within the PP
  – May precede their complement
    (12) át a fal-on
         through the wall-sup
         through the wall
  – Separable from their complement by degree modifiers
    (13) a ház-on teljesen kívül
         the house-sup entirely outside.of
         entirely outside of the house

• Separability in the clause
  – Wh-movement with P-stranding
    (14) Mi-n ment át?
         what-sup go.past.3sg through?
         What did he go through?
  – Preverbal position, acting as a verbal particle
    (15) János át-ment a híd-on.
         John through-went the bridge-on
         John crossed the bridge/walked across the bridge.

4 PP-internal differences: word order

Most neutral position: postpositional, immediately behind the complement.
Other possible PP-internal positions: i) KP > degree expression > P, and ii) prepositional.
Empirical question: is one of these orders systematically available to more Ps than the other?
We expect that if any of the orders is easier to get, it is the KP > degree expression > P order, because it is still postpositional.
Degree modifier intervention

Both grammatical

(16) a fal-on teljesen át
the wall-sup wholly through
entirely through the wall

(18) a ház-hoz egészen közel
the house-all completely close
very close to the house

(20) a ház-zal közvetlenül szemben
the house-ins immediately opposite.at
right opposite the house

(22) a folyó-n teljesen túl
the river-sup completely beyond
completely beyond the river

(24) a folyó-n teljesen végig
the river-sup completely end.to
all along the river

Asymmetry I.

(26) a folyó-n teljesen keresztül
the river-sup completely through
completely across the river

Asymmetry II.

(28) a ház-on teljesen belül
the house-sup completely inside
completely inside the house

(30) a csapat-tal teljesen együtt
the team-ins completely together
completely together with the team

(32) a ház-on közvetlenül kívül
the house-sup immediately outside
right outside the house

(34) a ház-zal egyenesen szembe
the house-ins straight opposite.to
straight opposite to the house

(36) a ház-zal majdnem szemközt
the house-ins almost opposite.at
almost opposite to the house

P > KP order

(17) át a fal-on
through the wall-sup
through the wall

(19) közel a ház-hoz
close the house-all
close to the house

(21) szemben a ház-zal
opposite.at the house-ins
opposite the house

(23) túl a folyó-n
beyond the river-sup
beyond the river

(25) végig a folyó-n
end.to the river-sup
all along the river

(27) keresztül a folyó-n
through the river-sup
across the river

(29) *belül a ház-on
inside the house-sup
inside the house

(31) *együtt Mari-val
together Mary-ins
together with Mary

(33) *kívül a ház-on
outside the house
outside of the house

(35) *szembe a ház-zal
opposite.to the house-ins
opposite to the house

(37) *szemközt a ház-zal
opposite.at the house-ins
opposite to the house
Asymmetry III.

Discussion:
1) most naked Ps can be separated from the complement by a degree modifier, this order does not yield severe ungrammaticality with any naked P.
2) the prepositional order is much more restricted, some naked Ps reject it entirely
3) correlation bw. the 2 orders: the prepositional order is more restricted than the separated postpositional

Conclusion: i) the KP > modifier > P order is almost always good (in this they sharply contrast with dressed Ps), ii) the literature is not right in claiming that naked Ps can generally be prepositional

5 Differences in clausal positions

Separability in two ways: i) P is immediately preverbal (particle), DP is postverbal, and ii) wh-movement of DP with P-stranding.
Empirical question: is one of these orders systematically easier to get than the other?
We expect that if any of these orders is easier to get, it is the one with the preverbal (particle) P, as P-stranding is a cross-linguistically marked structure (Van Riemsdijk 1978).

Acting as a verbal particle
P > V > DP+case

wh-movement, P-stranding
(+wh)DP+case > V > P

Both grammatical

(46) János át-ment a híd-on
John through-went the bridge-sup
John crossed the bridge.

(47) Mi-n ment át János?
what-sup went through John
What did John cross?

(48) Együtt vacsoráz-ott Mari-val.
together done-past.3sg Mary-with
He dined together with Mary.

(49) Ki-vel vacsoráz-ott együtt?
Who-with dine-past.3sg together
Who did he dine with?
(50) János keresztül-ment a híd-on. John across-went the bridge-sup
John crossed the bridge.

(51) Melyik híd-on ment keresztül János? which bridge-sup went through John
Which bridge did John go through?

(52) A posta közel van a the post.office closet.to be.3sg the híd-hoz. bridge-allat
The post office is close to the bridge.

(53) Mi-hez van közel a posta? what-allat be-3sg close.to the post.office
What is the post office close to?

(54) János szem-be jött Mari-val. John opposite-to came Mary-with
John and Mary walked towards each other.

(55) Ki-vel jött szembe János? who-with came opposite.to John
Who did John walk towards?

(56) János végig-sétál-t a híd-on. John along-walk-past.3sg the bridge-sup
John walked along the bridge.

(57) Melyik híd-on sétál-t végig? which bridge-sup walk-past.3sg along
Which bridge did he walk across?

Asymmetry

(58) A játékos belül volt a vonal-on. the player inside was the line-sup
The player was inside the line.

(59) ?Melyik vonal-on volt belül a labda? which line-sup was inside the ball
Which line was the ball inside?

(60) A fa szemben van a híd-dal. the tree opposite be.3sg the bridge-with
The tree is opposite the bridge.

(61) ?Mi-vel van szemben a fa? what-with be.3sg opposite the tree
What is the tree opposite to?

(62) A festék túl-folyt a vonal-on. the paint over-went the line-sup
The paint went over the line.

(63) ?Mi-n folyt túl a festék? what-sup went beyond the pain
What did the paint go beyond?

Both degraded

(64) *Az almá-t alul ad-ta az the apple-acc below give-past.3sg the ár-on price-sup
He sold the apple cheaper than expected.

(65) ??Mi-vel van szemközt a posta? what-with be opposite the post.office
What is the post office opposite to?

Both ungrammatical

(66) *Az almá-t alul ad-ta az the apple-acc below give-past.3sg the ár-on price-sup
He sold the apple cheaper than expected.

(67) *Mi-n üt-ött alul? what-sup hit-past.3sg below
What did he hit below?
(68) *a kép felül van a kandalló-n
the picture abov be.3sg the fireplace-sup
The picture is above the fireplace.

(69) *Mi-n van feül a kép?
what-sup be.3sg above the picture
What is the picture above?

(70) *A ház innen van a fá-k-on.
the house this.side be.3sg the tree-pl-sup
The house is between us and the trees.

(71) *Mi-n van innen a ház?
what-sup be.3sg this.side the house
The house is on this side of what?

(72) *A labda kívül-re es-ett a
the ball outside-to fall-past.3sg the
vonal-on.
line-sup
The ball fell outside of the area enclosed
by the line.

(73) *Mi-n es-ett kívül-re a
What-sup fall-past.3sg outside-to the
labda?
ball
What did the ball fall outside of?

(74) *Az utazó túl-ról jött a
the traveller beyond-from came the
hegy-en.
mountain-on
The traveller came from beyond the moun-
tain.

(75) *Mi-n jött túl-ról János?
what-sup came beyond-from John
What did John come from beyond?

(76) *A labda kívül van a vonal-on.
the ball outside be.3sg the line-sup
The ball is outside of the line.

(77) *Mi-n es-ett kívül a labda?
what-sup fall-past outside.of the ball
What did the ball fall outside of?

We also expect that the opposite (i.e. P-stranding is easier than P as a particle) may possibly be attested with source Ps, as these never serve as verbal particles in Hungarian (É. Kiss, 2002; Surányi, 2009a).

Source (Ablative) Ps:

(78) *A labda túl-ra es-ett a
the ball beyond-to fall-past.3sg the
vonal-on.
line-sup
The ball landed on the other side of the
line.

(79) *Mi-n es-ett túl-ra a
what-sup fall-past.3sg beyond-to the
labda?
ball
What did the ball fall beyond?

(80) *A hang kívül-ről jött a
the sound outside-from came the
ház-on.
house-sup
The sound came from outside the house.

(81) *Mi-n jött kívül-ről a hang?
what-sup came outside-from the sound
What did the sound come outside of?

(82) *A lövés-ek szem-ből jött-ek a
the shot-pl opposite-from came-3pl the
postá-val.
post.office-with
The shots came from opposite the post office.

(83) *Mi-vel jött-ek szem-ből a
what-with came-3pl opposite-from the
lövés-ek?
shot-pl
What did the shots come opposite from?
Discussion:
1) not every naked P is equally separable from the complement in the clause
2) there is no significant asymmetry bw. the two kinds of separability
3) SourcePs, which may potentially show an asymmetry (might separate by P-stranding only), are inseparable

Conclusion: the literature is not right in claiming that naked Ps can be generally separated from their complement in the clause.

6 Analysis

6.1 Recapitulation of the empirical findings

Naked Ps behave alike wrt to the type of complement they take (case-marked) and their agreement properties. However, a few of them are degraded when they are not immediately behind the complement.

Within the PP, most can be separated from the complement if postpositional. The prepositional order, however, is fairly restricted (not available to all naked Ps).

In the clause, not every P is separable from the complement. Separability by verbal particle movement and by P-stranding for the same P are roughly equally possible.

So being “naked” is a necessary but not sufficient condition for separability from the complement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>postposition</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>prepositional</th>
<th>particle use</th>
<th>P-stranding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>át</td>
<td>through, across, via</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>közel</td>
<td>close to</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szemben</td>
<td>opposite.at</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>végigg</td>
<td>(along) to the end of</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keresztül</td>
<td>through, across, via</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>túl</td>
<td>beyond</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belül</td>
<td>inside of</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>együtt</td>
<td>together</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szembe</td>
<td>opposite.to</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szemközt</td>
<td>opposite.at</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alul</td>
<td>below</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felül</td>
<td>over</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innen</td>
<td>on this side of</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kívül-re</td>
<td>outside-to, beside-to</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kívül-ről</td>
<td>outside-from</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>túl-ra</td>
<td>beyond-to</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>túl-ról</td>
<td>beyond-from</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kívül</td>
<td>outside, beside</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>szemből</td>
<td>opposite.from</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Word order possibilities of naked postpositions
Interestingly, there is an almost complete correlation between a P having a prepositional order and being able to be separated from its complement.

6.2 Proposal

Postpositional Ps are in Place or Path (regardless of whether naked or dressed)

(84) merging naked P

```
PlaceP
  \_ Place  KP
    \_ DP    K
      \_ a vonal -on
```

(85) deriving postpositional naked P

```
PlaceP
  \_ KP
    \_ Place  t
      \_ DP    K
        \_ a vonal -on
```

PlaceP and PathP always move as a unit (i.e. KP is not extracted from them).

The Figure is merged in the specifier of pP, a higher functional projection (cf. vP in the verbal domain, and den Dikken, 2010; Svenonius, 2010 for parallels bw. v and p). Prepositional Ps are derived from moving the adposition to the p head.\(^1\)

(86)

```
Pp
  \_ Figure
    \_ p
      \_ PlaceP
        \_ KP
          \_ DP    K
            \_ a vonal -on
```

(87)

```
Pp
  \_ Figure
    \_ p
      \_ PlaceP
        \_ KP
          \_ DP    K
            \_ a vonal -on
```

The obvious alternative is that prepositional naked Ps don’t involve movement of the complement to spec, PlaceP, they correspond to the base-generated order.

Problem No1: this could not capture the observed correlation bw. prepositional order and separability

Problem No2: this doesn’t allow a unified account of PlaceP: with dressed Ps, KP always moves to spec, PlaceP.

\(^1\)Hegedűs (2013) argues that naked Ps are base-generated in p with a Place/PathP complement and free head-initial or head-final ordering. In order to derive the restrictions on the word order variation observed here, an additional projection would have to be assumed for the strictly postpositional naked Ps.
The prepositional order and the separability from the complement correlate because both involve the P in a higher position in the extended PP. Both particle use and P-stranding involve a step where PlaceP moves to a PP-internal escape hatch (this is an optional movement). Such an escape hatch has also been argued for in den Dikken (2010); we adapt his term for the relevant projection and call it CP_{PP}.

P-stranding: extraction of PlaceP from spec, CP_{PP}
particle use: extraction of pP from under CP_{PP}, leaving PlaceP behind

Note that these movements separate the naked P and its complement only if the naked P moves out of PlaceP, up to p. If the naked P stays in the Place head, PlaceP extraction or pP extraction from CP_{PP} won’t affect its post-KP position.

This is a good result, as we have observed (and now derived) that the prepositional order and separability in the clause do correlate.
Which naked Ps can move to $p$?
This appears to be a lexically idiosyncratic property. We argue that for those naked Ps that can be
prepositional, a grammaticalization process has begun. Grammaticalization involves elements moving
up the tree first, then being merged directly in the higher position. Naked Ps at this stage involve
movement rather than higher base-generation.
The semantic content of $p$ is different from Place and Path, cf. van Riemsdijk (1990), it is less
lexical/more functional. Locatives involve an orientation component, while directionals involve a goal
component. (The source meaning is excluded, which fits well with the observation that Source Ps are
never particles.)

Our results thus provide further evidence for the idea that extended XPs show cross-categorial paral-
lelisms, cf. the escape hatch in CP or DP (on the latter, see esp. Szabolcsi (1994)).

7 PP-internal differences: complements

7.1 The data

Grammatical

(94) A táská-d alul van
the bag-poss.2sg below be.3sg
Your bag is down there.

(96) A táská-d fölül van
the bag-poss.2sg above be.3sg
Your bag is up there.

(98) A labda kívül-re es-ett.
the ball outside.to fall-past.3sg
The ball landed outside.

(100) János át-jött.
John through-came.3sg
John came over.

(102) A posta közel van
the post.office close.to be.3sg
The post office is close by/to here.

(95) A táská-d belül van
the bag-poss.2sg inside be.3sg
Your bag is inside.

(97) A szék-ek kívül vannak.
The chair-pl outside be.3pl
The chairs are outside.

(99) A hang kívül-ről jött.
the sound outside.from came.3sg
The sound came from outside.

(101) együtt van-nak/*van
together be-3pl/be.3sg
they are together/he is together

(103) A lövés-ek szemből jött-ek.
the shot-pl opposite.from came-3pl
The shots came from the opposite side.
Not perfect

(106) (?)túl ment.
  beyond went.3sg
  It went too far.

(107) ??A posta szemközt van.
  the post.office opposite be.3sg
  The post office is opposite.

Ungrammatical

(108) *János túl-ra megy
  John beyond-to go
  John goes beyond

(109) *János túl-ról jön
  John beyond-from come
  John comes from beyond

(110) *A táska innen van
  the bag this.side.of be.3sg
  The bag is on this side.

(111) *János végig sétál-t
  John along.to.end walk-past.3sg
  John walked to the end
  NB: ok iff végig is a temporal adv.

(112) János keresztül *lovagol-t/?*ment
  John through ride-past.3sg/went.3sg

Conclusion: not all naked Ps can appear without an overt complement.

7.2 Analysis

We suggest that there is a neat pattern behind the grammatical / not perfect / ungrammatical divide above.

Grammatical:
The Figure is interpreted wrt an implicit ground here/there, the spatial center of deixis of the discourse. We suggest that "no overt complement" means the presence of an implicit complement rather than a genuine intransitive P.

(113) \[PP \text{naked P} \ [PP \text{(here/there)}]]\]

NB: Svenonius (2010, p. 137) also observes a correlation bw. a null complement and the possibility of an overt there complement in English, and likewise suggest the presence of an unpronounced complement.

Not perfect: túl “beyond” and szemközt “opposite”
The Ground cannot be interpreted as here/there, the spatial center of deixis of the discourse. The these data require a strong context, whereby a specific Ground is recoverable from the speech situation. We suggest that these are elliptical structures.
We went beyond the corner.

Structure for (115):

\[
[pP \ t\ul \ [\text{PlaceP a sark-on}]]
\]

Ungrammatical: \(t\ul\ra\) “beyond-to”, \(t\ul\rol\) “beyond-from”, \(innen\) “on this side of”, \(v\text{egig}\) “along to the end”, \(kereszt\ul\) “via”

The meaning of these Ps is such that they require a Ground different from \(here/there\). As only \(here/there\) can be implicit, these Ps have an overt complement. Further question: why don’t they allow ellipsis?

**Conclusion:** naked Ps cannot be intransitive, but their complement \(here/there\) can appear with a zero phonological form.

### 8 Extensions

**Old observation:** Even if a naked P is separable from the complement on a locative reading, it is never separable from it in the temporal reading (Máracz, 1984; Asbury, 2008; Surányi, 2009a)

This sounds like a systematic contrast on a large number of lexical items.

But: only 4 naked Ps have temporal readings in the first place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>postposition</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>temporal</th>
<th>reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>át</td>
<td>through, across</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belül</td>
<td>inside of</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keresztől</td>
<td>through</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>túl</td>
<td>beyond</td>
<td>yes, but restricted</td>
<td>beyond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3:** Naked Ps allowing a temporal reading

Of these, belül is not prepositional and separable on the spatial reading either.

\[
\begin{align*}
(117) & \text{ a doboz-on belül} \\
& \text{the box-sup inside.of} \\
& \text{inside the box }
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(118) *\text{belül a doboz-on} \\
& \text{inside.of the box-sup} \\
& \text{inside the box }
\]

\(t\ul\) is more complicated even on the spatial reading than it seems at first sight. The prepositional order appears to be good in isolation, but severely degrades in specific sentences, and the particle reading is always directional instead of locative.

\[
\begin{align*}
(119) & \text{ a folyó-n túl} \\
& \text{the river-sup beyond} \\
& \text{beyond the river }
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(120) \text{ t\ul a folyó-n} \\
& \text{beyond the river-sup} \\
& \text{beyond the river }
\]

\[
(121) *\text{T\ul a folyó-n} \text{ 3 erdő is van} \\
& \text{beyond the river-sup 3 forest too be.3sg} \\
& \text{beyond the river there are as much as 3 forests}
\]

14
3 forest too be.3sg beyond the river-sup beyond the river there are as much as 3 forests

the plane the river-sup beyond fell down
The plane fell down beyond the river.

Particle use only with dynamic verbs.

The plane fell down beyond the river.

Applications submitted beyond the deadline are invalid.

bonds that have expired more than 60 days ago (lit. beyond 60 days)

The injuries heal in over 8 days (lit. beyond 8 days)

át and keresztül: in the temporal use they have no goal meaning component, but the particle use involves that meaning.

Temporal PPs remain a problem.

We have proposed that

● the prepositional order is derived by adposition movement to p
● there is no subextraction from PathP/PlaceP, but there is subextraction from pP
● the particle use and P-stranding involve PathP/PlaceP movement to spec, CP_{PP}
● spec, CP_{PP} is a PP-internal escape hatch
● this corroborates cross-linguistic findings about the fine structure of the PP and contributes to our understanding about the universal structure of adpositions
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